Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/unionorseparatio00ashm

SEVENTH AND REVISED EDITION.

UNION OR SEPARATION

REFERENCE DEPARTMENT, THE NATIONAL UNION, 30 JAN. 94 & POLITICAL LIBRARY.

BY

Sir E. ASHMEAD BARTLETT, M.P.

ALSO AN

ANALYSIS OF MR. GLADSTONE'S "HOME RULE" BILL OF 1893.

WITH A COMPARISON OF

THE TWO BILLS OF 1886 & 1893.

AND 50 SPECIAL APPENDICES.

PRICE ONE SHILLING.

London:
PUBLISHED BY THE NATIONAL UNION, ST. STEPHEN'S CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, AND PRINTED BY McCORQUODALE AND COMPANY LIMITED, "THE ARMOURY," SOUTHWARK, S.E.

1893.

Dedication.

TO THE LOYALISTS OF IRELAND,

PROTESTANT AND ROMAN CATHOLIC ALIKE;

"THE ENGLISH GARRISON IN IRELAND;"

THE MEN WHOSE ANCESTORS HAVE HELPED TO BUILD UP

AND GUARD THE EMPIRE,

AND WHO HAVE GIVEN THE UNITED KINGDOM SOME OF ITS

BRIGHTEST ORNAMENTS

IN STATESMANSHIP, IN ARMS, AND IN LAW

THIS WORK IS DEDICATED

BY ONE WHO IS DEVOTEDLY ATTACHED TO THEIR CAUSE.

PREFACE.

A82u

THIS Pamphlet is a new and revised edition of one of which four editions were issued during the election contest of 1886, and two editions in July, 1892.

The present edition contains a careful analysis of Mr. Gladstone's "Home Rule" Bill of 1893, and also the two Bills of 1886 and 1893, printed in parallel columns.

The main arguments against a separate Parliament for Ireland are eternal, but many new facts and conditions, notably the factions among the Irish Nationalists themselves, have come to light since 1886. These I have endeavoured to collect and embrace in the present edition.

There has also been added, in the shape of Appendices, an immense mass of very useful matter, bearing upon the chief issues between the two great parties in the State. For these statistics and facts, I have to express my obligation to the following publications: "The Speaker's Handbook on the Irish Question," by that able and eloquent Irish Loyalist, the late Mr. Arthur Patton; "Six Years' Work," issued by the Conservative Central Office, and compiled by its thorough and indefatigable editor, Mr. W. H. Rowe; and to "Then and Now," an admirable little brochure issued by the Liberal Union of Ireland.

I have also freely used the leaflets of the "National Union," which have been issued under my own supervision. I trust that the Pamphlet in its present form may be of service to the cause of the Union.

E. ASHMEAD BARTLETT.

March 22nd, 1893.

HARDING DEC 16 1940 LIBRARY SETS

402202

GOLD MEDAL,

TASMANIA, 1891-2.

NEW HOUSEHOLD Curative Remedies.

"PLATYPUS" EUCALYPTUS OIL

(Tasmanian Eucalyptus Globulus Oil).

"PLATYPUS BRAND"

Pronounced by the Inland Revenue an ABSOLUTELY PURE NATURAL PRODUCT.

Recognised by Doctors and the Medical Press as the Best and Safest Remedy for

INFLUENZA, COLDS, ASTHMA, BRONCHITIS, FEVERS, HEADACHE, NEURALGIA, RHEUMATISM, LUMBAGO, SCIATICA, SPRAINS, CHILBLAINS, &c.

Sold in Bottles only, bearing Trade Mark (a Platypus), 1/-, 2/6, *and* 4/6.

EUCALYPTOLIA, or Essence of Eucalyptus Globulus Oil.
Sold in Bottles only, bearing Trade Mark (a Platypus), 1/-, 2/6, *and* 4/6.

EUCALYPTUS PASTILLES (or JUJUBES). 1/- *per Box.*

EUCALYPTOLIA CREAM. For the Skin and Complexion 1/9 *per Box.*

EUCALYPTUS (TOILET) VINEGAR. Fragrant and Refreshing. 1/6 *per Bottle.*

EUCALYPTUS SOAP (HIGH-CLASS). Pure and Superfatted. 6d. *per Tablet.*

EUCALYPTUS OINTMENT. A wonderful healer for all Skin Diseases, Wounds, Chapped Hands, &c., &c. 1/1½ *per Jar.*

To be obtained from all Chemists, and from

The TASMANIAN EUCALYPTUS OIL Co., 131, Leadenhall St., London, E.C.

All our Preparations are marked "PLATYPUS BRAND." Take no others.

ENGLAND AND THE ENGLISH VOTE.

INTRODUCTION.

THE GENERAL ELECTION of 1886 was the first great battle in the campaign of the Union. The victory of the Union was then overwhelming. The Unionist Party came back with a majority of 116, pledged to maintain the United Kingdom and the integrity of the Empire. Out of the total of 393 Unionist Members there were 316 Conservatives, and 77 Liberal Unionists.

The issue was decided entirely by the *English* vote. Ireland sent a majority of 67 (85 Separatists to 18 Loyalists) pledged against the Union. Wales sent a Separatist majority of 16 (23 to 7). Scotland did better; but still Scotland gave a majority of 14 for Separation (43 Separatists to 29 Unionists). England, however, entirely wiped out and overwhelmed this Separatist majority of 97, which Ireland, Wales, and Scotland gave to Mr. Gladstone.

The English vote went almost solid for the Union. Out of the 465 members returned by England, only 125 were Separatists. The remaining 340 were Conservatives and Liberal Unionists. Thus England alone gave a majority of nearly 3 to 1 in favour of the Union (340 Unionists to 125 Separatists, including the Nationalist member for Liverpool).

The second struggle took place in July, 1892, though the issue was by no means so clearly defined as in 1886. At the former time the country had Mr. Gladstone's Scheme before it, and rejected Home Rule on its merits. Last July not a principle nor a detail of the New Scheme had been made public. There was

no "Home Rule" plan before the people. Yet in the General Election of July, 1892, though many seats were lost to the Unionist Party on bye-issues, not in any way connected with Home Rule, England alone returned a majority of 71 members (268 to 197) in favour of the Union. The majority of English electors in favour of the Union was over 100,000. Taking England and Scotland together, the Unionist majority was 43 in July, 1892. Taking England, Scotland and Wales together, there was still a Unionist majority of 17 in all Great Britain. Mr. Gladstone's majority is therefore purely Irish, and clerical-Irish, controlled with almost absolute power by Archbishop Walsh.

These facts have been overlooked far too much during the "Home Rule" contest. The English people are so great and strong that they have almost lost sight of their own nationality, and are in danger of forgetting what is due to their own interests and to their own race. There are 37,740,000 of people inhabiting the United Kingdom, and of these 27,560,000 inhabit England. But a large proportion of the Lowland Scotch are also Saxon, that is English in blood, and many of the people of Ulster are English in blood and history. The English people of the United Kingdom number at least 30,000,000, and probably near 33,000,000. This question of "Home Rule" has been too much treated as an Irish issue. It is not a purely Irish issue; it is a National and an Imperial Question. Whether it be just or unjust to grant a separate Parliament to Ireland, the interests of Great Britain and of the world-wide Empire of which the United Kingdom is the centre and the heart, must be first considered.

The Unionist party believe—and all the lessons of history and experience, past and present, support their belief—that union means strength, and that separate Parliaments and separate administrations mean, first discord and weakness, and then ultimate disruption and decay.

This is the lesson taught by the recent history of Italy, Germany, and the United States in favour of Union on the one

hand; and on the other by the history of Turkey, Austria, Norway and Sweden, and the South American Republics against a policy of Separation.

The Unionist party believe it to be most injurious to the solidarity of the United Kingdom, and of bad example and evil omen for the Empire at large, that the canker of separation should be established at the heart of our National and Imperial life.

In such a question as that of "Home Rule" for Ireland, involving as it does the fortunes and well-being of the whole United Kingdom, and largely affecting the fate of the three-hundred-and-forty millions of souls who, in distant lands acknowledge the sovereignty of the Queen, it is expedient and it is right that the interests of the majority should prevail. It is not right that the future destinies of the 34,740,000 should be sacrificed in the hope—a vain hope Unionists are convinced—of satisfying some 3,000,000 of discontented and disloyal Irishmen.

For that is the issue. There are 4,700,000 people in Ireland; of these at least 1,750,000 are loyal and devoted to the Union. Nay more, these Irish loyalists have given the most public and solemn proof in the recent Conventions at Belfast and Dublin, and by many other important assemblies throughout Ulster, that they will never submit their lives and fortunes to a separate Parliament at Dublin, which would be dominated by the same men who so long made the Land League and the National League agents of outrage, plunder and assassination.

The opponents of Irish "Home Rule" embrace almost every one of the Protestants of Ireland, numbering nearly 1,200,000, and a large number of the most intelligent Roman Catholics. It is notorious that the great industrial and progressive centres of Ulster, where the manufacture and wealth of Ireland are placed, especially Belfast, and a considerable part of Dublin as well, are entirely opposed to the Gladstonian policy.

Over 95 per cent. of all the Protestant bodies of Ireland—Presbyterians, Wesleyans, Baptists, Independents, not less than

Episcopalians—protest that they will never submit to a separate Parliament, which would be under the control of the Fenians or the priests. The utmost number of Separatists in Ireland is 3,000,000; but many of these are only "Home Rulers" from fear, physical or superstitions. "Home Rule" is at best a tremendous leap in the dark, fraught with the most appalling possibilities of disaster and ruin.

The warmest advocates of Irish Home Rule cannot show that it will benefit England or the British Colonies and dependencies throughout the world. Their whole case depends upon the supposed advantage to the Irish separatists. But is it not the height of madness to risk the future of 34,740,000 of our English, Scotch, Welsh and Irish fellow countrymen, in order to doubtfully please and benefit some 3,000,000 of misguided Irish Nationalists? Is it not the depth of human folly to set up the dangerous and fatal example of Separation in face of the 340,000,000 of our fellow subjects abroad, upon whose commerce and prosperity the well being of the United Kingdom so largely depends?

The real temper of the Nationalist leaders towards England is shown whenever they are opposed and fail to get exactly the full measure of their *demands*. Thus, speaking at Dublin on September 3rd, 1886, Mr. William O'Brien, M.P., said:—

They are dealing now, not with this small land, but with the gigantic Ireland across the Atlantic, an Ireland where the British Coercion Acts never ran (cheers) and *where a British redcoat never set his foot except to run.* (Laughter and loud cheers.) I want to say before I retire that these Irish-Americans are very extreme men. So are we all, I hope, extreme men. (Cheers.) *We are all, I hope, as extreme as they* in resenting and resisting English rule in Ireland. (Cheers.) . . . . . This is the message that that great nation of ours across the water bade us bring to you:—"Go on as you have been going. Give a good account of the Churchills—(hisses)—and the Beaches—(hisses)—and the Castlereaghs—(prolonged hisses)—and the Bullers—(hisses)—*and all the rest of the Bull family* (laughter) who came over here to govern us against our will. Go on as you have been going, and I promise you, for *all these millions in America, that they never will spare their treasury, aye, and if the chance offers they never will spare their blood.* (Loud cheers.) On and on until this great fight is ended in the happiness and *the independence of the bright green land that bore us.* (Cheers.)—*Irish Times' report.*

And, as Mr. Thomas Sexton said, at the Parnell Banquet, in December, 1883:—

> I will not mince my words, and I say that the *one prevailing and unchangeable passion between Ireland and England is the passion of hate.*

Even if the interests of the three millions of Separatist Irish demanded "Home Rule," it would still be ridiculous to sacrifice the greatest good of far the greatest number in order to gratify the prejudices of an infinitesimal minority. But the six years of Unionist administration, from 1885 to 1892, proved that Ireland could be governed in prosperity, peace, and content, and that without "Home Rule." It is noteworthy that the Irish Separatists who represent only 3,000,000, out of 37,740,000 of people in the United Kingdom, demand that their wishes and policy shall override the interests of the other 34,740,000. These same Irish Separatists absolutely deny the right of the Irish Loyalists in Ulster and throughout Ireland to remain under the Imperial Parliament. Yet the Irish Loyalists bear an infinitely larger proportion to the whole Irish population (as one to two), than the proportion (about one to thirteen) which the Irish Separatists bear to the whole population of the United Kingdom.

During the General Election, 1885, the Radical speakers denounced the Irish Parnellite party, and the latter retaliated with quite equal acerbity. Mr. T. P. O'Connor spoke thus at Manchester, in November, 1885:—

> "If I were addressing a Radical audience, I would ask them if they were going to vote for the party that swore they would never give Ireland coercion, *and then coerced Ireland as Tory party never did;* I would ask them if they were going to put in the party which raised the taxation of the country, after preaching economy, to the highest point to which it had ever yet been. I would say in God's name put out the traitors to Radical principles, and see if they cannot do better with the Tory democracy. (Loud cheers.) I would ask them if they were going to vote for the party which had the blood of Gordon on its head, and which had been guilty of the tomfoolery of putting down three yards of railway and then pulling it up again; for the men who said one day of the week they would go to Khartoum, and the next day of the week changed their minds; as if they were talking about an excursion

to Belle Vue. (Laughter and cheers.) During last week I have been busy, replying to a number of appeals from Radical candidates to be spared from the manifesto—(loud laughter)—but my reply in every case was 'No Radical need apply.' (Loud cheers)."

MR. GLADSTONE ON THE ENGLISH.

The present Separatist Bill is only the latest stage in the anti-English policy which Mr. Gladstone initiated in 1868. He then boasted that he was about to lay the axe at the root of "British Ascendancy" in Ireland, and that he intended to destroy the "Upas tree" of British power. At each step in his destructive progress, in his legislation of 1868, 1870, 1881, Mr. Gladstone promised that his policy had reached finality, and would surely prove successful in pacifying Ireland. In every case his confident predictions were equally falsified.

The present scheme is a last desperate effort to patch up his repeated failures in the past by throwing the National Unity and the Constitution of the United Kingdom into the melting pot.

To one policy alone has Mr. Gladstone been constant—hatred of England and of English power, and a perpetual desire to diminish English influence and to disparage English credit and greatness. In an unguarded moment Mr. Gladstone has quite lately exposed his rooted aversion to England and the English race.

He has recently written a letter to an American lawyer, who issued a work entitled "The Puritan in Holland, England, and America." The work in question is, as Mr. Goldwin Smith has stated in the *Times*, an anti-English book. Its author "seeks to show that whatever is good in American character

and institutions had its source not in England, but in Holland." In that letter Mr. Gladstone has made the very remarkable statement :—

> The English race (I am a pure Scotchman) are a great fact in the world, and I believe will so continue; but no race stands in greater need of discipline in every form, and, among other forms, that which is administered by criticism vigorously directed to canvassing their character and claims. Under such discipline I believe they are capable of a great elevation and of high performances.

In 1886, after the General Election, Mr. Gladstone denounced what he called "The Southern English," which meant practically the whole English people, as the principal enemies of his policy, and he made the remarkable statement that the whole civilised world was in favour of his Separatist policy for Ireland. As England then returned 340 Unionist members and only 125 Separatists, or a majority of nearly three to one in favour of the Union, it is obvious that Mr. Gladstone considered England outside the pale of the civilised world.

Notwithstanding the losses at the General Election in July last, there is still a large majority in England for the Union. In July, 1892, the English people again returned a Unionist majority of seventy-one. So Mr. Gladstone now indulges in another attack upon the English race. He boasts that he is a "pure Scotchman" (born in Liverpool, by-the-bye, and enjoying his father's fortune made at Liverpool). As Mr. Goldwin Smith wrote :—

> Sir Walter Scott also was a pure Scotchman, not only by birth, but in every respect; yet we may doubt whether the gift from an American of a book depreciating England would have drawn from him a similar letter. The birthplace of Mr. Gladstone seems not less gloriously doubtful than that of Homer, but we know that he was bred in England; brought up at an English school, and an English University; shared the bounty of an English founder; was indebted for his brilliant start in life to honours won at an English University; was brought into Parliament through the influence of an English nobleman for an English borough; sat for English constituencies nearly all his life; and, apparently, owes as much to England as ever a man owed to his country.

In the extract quoted above, Mr. Gladstone has the audacity to state, with regard to the English, that "No race stands in greater need of discipline in every form," and he adds that such discipline should be "administered by criticism directed to canvassing their character and claims." It is quite clear what this means. Mr. Gladstone wishes to decry the right of the English race to form the keystone and unifying force of these islands and their vast Empire.

Mr. Jesse Collings, in his able speech on the Queen's Speech, on February 8th, in favor of the English Agricultural Labourer, referred to a most offensive passage from this same American work, which Mr. Gladstone praises so highly. The following is an extract from Mr. Jesse Collings' speech: —

> Who are these labourers on whose behalf I speak? They are not men who shot people or who burn ricks and commit other outrages, such as maiming cattle. I have noticed a book published in America and written for the consumption among the enemies of England. It is a book written to disparage and be-little England, and it is with great regret that I have seen a letter from the Prime Minister speaking of "the value and the importance of a work like this." I refer to the book because it speaks of *the English agricultural labourer as "well nigh the most ignorant and brutalised among the so-called civilised people of the world."* ("Oh.") That is not a book which should be praised by any Englishman or Scotchman either. The man who wrote it is a disgraceful slanderer. (Cheers.) The writer is totally ignorant or he lies. (Renewed cheers.) I speak warmly on this subject because it touches me to the quick to have this said of a people to whom I am greatly attached; and I indignantly cast the slander away, even although it has been praised by the Prime Minister of England. I prefer the testimony of the great naturalist who said that, "in spite of all the agitators who had gone amongst them, the labourer remains a fine sample of the English race, manly and faithful." (Cheers.)

The English people represent 30,000,000 at least out of the 38,000,000 who inhabit the United Kingdom. A thousand years ago a great English monarch, Egbert, and his greater son Alfred, made the English people into one nation and one kingdom. From

that moment England, which had been divided into many different states, and had therefore been weak and unimportant, became great and strong.

To England were gradually joined the neighbouring peoples, whom geographical, political and commercial reasons marked out for such union. Step by step Wales and Ireland and Scotland were united to the chief and central country, and the union has been as advantageous to them as to England. Around this United Kingdom has been built up, by the courage and enterprise of our fathers, the greatest and wealthiest dominion that the world has ever known. That Empire, of which the United Kingdom is the centre and the heart, numbers over three hundred and forty millions of souls, and covers over nine millions of square miles in every part of the globe. No country has ever possessed so vast an Empire, or one which is so beneficial to other races, so civilised and civilising.

After all is said and done, and after the fullest acknowledgment is made of the high qualities shown by the other races now united into one great nation with the English, it is England and the English race that have made the United Kingdom and built up the Empire. The main factor in our National Unity at home, and our Imperial greatness abroad, is England and the English race. It is English enterprise, and English valour, English tenacity and English statesmanship which have borne the chief part in building up, in developing and in welding together that mighty and beneficent fabric of power and dominion which is known as the British Empire. No people and no race have ever shown such an Imperial genius, such a capacity for government as the English. None have ever established and maintained such an Empire as that of England—an Empire which is as great a blessing to alien and inferior races as it is a source of power and wealth to the central and parent country.

Englishmen are anxious to be just and even generous to the

races with which they are associated. Especially have they shown themselves ready to give full justice to Ireland.

The English people have always shewn themselves in great crises of their history able to rise above petty or sectional or party interests, and to decide as becomes a governing and Imperial race. There is a point at which the English people must draw the line. There is a point at which they must oppose an unflinching resistance to the enemies of their race and of their Empire. That point marks the dividing line between National Unity and Separation, between the integrity of their Empire and its disruption.

The politician, however eminent or eloquent, who disparages the English race, and who would break up the National Unity of these realms, is wholly unworthy of the confidence of Englishmen.

THE HOME RULE BILL OF 1893.

MR. GLADSTONE'S SCHEME ANALYSED.

[*N.B.—The two Home Rule Bills of* 1886 *and* 1893 *will be found arranged in parallel columns at the end of the Pamphlet, after the last Appendix.*]

The Home Rule Bill of 1893 bristles with difficulties. It is far more complicated and perplexing than the Bill of 1886. The retention of 80 Irish Members in the Imperial Parliament, and the attempt to discriminate between Irish, British, and Imperial affairs, renders the Bill utterly impracticable. Mr. Gladstone's latest scheme is simply a hopeless mass of quandaries, inconsistencies, and impossibilities.

UNION IS STRENGTH.

There is at the outset the main and eternal objection to any and every plan of separation. The establishment of a separate Irish Parliament means the launching of this ancient and great country upon the fatal path of disunion and decay. It reverses the whole of the past history of England, and goes contrary to all the lessons of experience. Every great nation of modern times, as well as of ancient, has grown in strength, in prosperity, and in civilisation by adopting a policy of consolidation and closer union. During the Middle Ages France, step by step, consolidated her separate provinces and divisions into one kingdom, and France grew in strength with each increase of unity. Much the same consolidation took place in Spain and with similar results. This, also, is the irrefutable lesson taught by the example of Italy, of Germany, of the United States, and of every powerful nation, ancient and modern alike. Why, then, should England, at the close of the nineteenth century, in the very heyday of her progress and strength, adopt the disastrous, and too often fatal, policy of separation? Mr. Gladstone, in his speech on Feb. 13th, 1893, introducing the "Home Rule" Bill, gave not a single reason, beyond a vague idea of gratifying

Vide pp. 75 to 82.

some three millions of Celtic Irish, why a policy so injurious should be adopted by this country.

PRINCIPAL FEATURES OF THE BILL.

The principal features of the new Home Rule scheme, as embodied in Mr. Gladstone's Bill, are—

1. The creation of a new Irish Parliament consisting of two Chambers. The Upper Chamber is called "The Legislative Council," and will consist of forty-eight members, who are to be elected by all voters rated at above £20 annual value., *i.e.*, by about 165,000 electors in all. The Lower Chamber will be called "The Legislative Assembly," and will consist of 103 members, elected just as the 103 Irish members are elected at present to the Imperial Parliament. No change in the Legislative Assembly is to be made for a period of six years. In case of differences between the two Chambers, they are to meet together and decide the final issue by voting together.

2. The control and administration of all Irish affairs, and the power of legislating for Ireland, including, after six years, legislation upon the Judiciary and the Police, are to be handed over to the new Irish Parliament. Certain subjects, such as the Crown, foreign affairs, peace or war, religious education and religious establishment, external trade, personal freedom, &c., are reserved for the Imperial Parliament. The question of the land is also to be reserved, but only for three years. The Judges are to be appointed by the Imperial Government for six years only. Those Judges appointed after the passing of the Act are to be removable on an address presented by both Houses of the Irish Legislature. As the Nationalist party will control both Houses, the Irish Judges will be at the mercy of the dominant faction.

3. The only provisions for maintaining the supremacy of the Imperial Parliament are a general and vague expression in the preamble of the Bill to that effect, and a power of veto given to the Viceroy for its exercise in particular cases and under the direction of the Sovereign. The Viceroy, however, may be a Roman Catholic, and is to be appointed for six years. The executive of the new Irish Parliament is to consist of a Committee of the Irish Privy Council. This Committee will be the Irish Cabinet. By the advice of this Irish Cabinet the Viceroy is to act in the use of the veto-power given to him, except in special cases where otherwise directed by the Sovereign.

4. A curious attempt is made to introduce something like the powers of the Supreme Court of the United States into the British Constitution. Questions relating to the validity of any Bill passed by the Irish Parliament may be referred to the

Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in London, without the right of appeal to the House of Lords. If this right of appeal be limited to the Viceroy and Secretary of State for the Home Departments, and not given to private citizens, this provision would be almost valueless to Irish loyalists. Any person who now has a right of appeal from an Irish Court to the House of Lords, will instead be entitled to appeal to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

5. With regard to finance, the new Irish Budget is to amount to £5,660,000 on the income side, and £5,160,000 on the expense side. This will leave a surplus of £500,000 for the Irish Parliament to deal with as they please—that is, to pay their Ministers and their members, to reinstate the evicted tenants, or for any other purpose. The share which Ireland has in future to pay towards Imperial charges is to be the amount of the receipts from Customs which now equal £2,370,000. This, according to Mr. Gladstone's speech of February 13th, amounts to nearly one twenty-fifth of the total Imperial charges; whereas the Irish representation of 80 members in the Imperial Parliament is to be nearly one-eighth of its total number. The question of further contributions in case of war or extraordinary expenses is apparently to be left to the generosity of the new Irish Parliament.

6. The most novel and impracticable condition of the new Bill is, however, the retention of the 80 Irish members at Westminster, and the provisions for their voting. Some attempt is made in Mr. Gladstone's scheme to discriminate between Imperial and British questions. Each separate House of the Imperial Parliament is to decide, in case of dispute, how it is to be settled, whether a question is Imperial or purely British. This will mean that the decision is left to the party majority, and must give rise to endless debates and quarrels. The Irish contingent of eighty is nominally to be allowed to vote upon Imperial questions, but not upon British questions. But, inasmuch as the Irish eighty are to be permitted to vote upon every vote of want of confidence in the Imperial Ministry, and also to vote, according to Mr. Gladstone's speech of February 13th, upon any motion "incidental" to "any Bill or motion expressly confined to Great Britain," it is clear that the Irish eighty will be able to vote on almost any question, and at almost any moment to decide the fate of the British or Imperial Ministry. Moreover, as the right of dealing with Irish Taxation, except Customs, is left to the Irish Parliament, the Imperial Parliament will, by losing its direct control of Irish Estimates, lose its chief means of controlling its Irish representatives. But this astounding proposal will be dealt with later on.

MR. GLADSTONE'S FIVE PRINCIPLES.

Vide Appendix VIII.

In its details the plan is full of absurd impracticability. Mr. Gladstone laid down five principles as underlying the present Bill, no less than that of 1886. His first principle is the maintenance of Imperial unity. Mr. Gladstone stated that there should be a separate Parliament in Dublin for legislation and administration with regard to Irish affairs; with this limitation—that there should be "nothing in the plan inconsistent with Imperial unity." Mr. Gladstone's second principle is that there should be a perfect "equality between all the kingdoms;" his third, that there should be an "equitable repartition of Imperial charges between Great Britain and Ireland." Mr. Gladstone's fourth principle is that the Bill should contain "any and every practical provision for the protection of minorities" in Ireland. His fifth principle is that the scheme should contain the "characteristics of a real and continuous settlement" of the question.

NO CAUSE FOR THE BILL.

As Mr. Balfour showed in his able speech, on February 14th, no practical reason has been given for the introduction of any such Bill. In 1886 the disturbed condition of Ireland and the prevalence of crime were Mr. Gladstone's ostensible reasons for then adopting "Home Rule." This argument of despair had great weight in 1886, especially with the working classes. They were impressed with the discontented and lawless state of Ireland, and were inclined to accept the argument of the Separatists that autonomy was the only remedy. It was, in fact, according to Mr. Gladstone in 1886, a choice between "Home Rule" or Drastic Coercion. No such reasons exist now, for the result of six years of Unionist administration of Ireland had been in July, 1892, to reduce crime to a minimum, and to restore peace and contentment to the Irish people. Mr. Morley, in his speech on the Address, bore direct witness to the vastly improved condition of Ireland. He said rents were being duly paid, and juries could be trusted to do their duty.

The number of agrarian crimes during Mr. Gladstone's administration from 1880 to 1884, inclusive, amounted to 12,089—that is an annual average of 2,417. The number of agrarian crimes in the years 1885 and 1886, during which Mr. Gladstone and Lord Salisbury were each in power for about twelve months out of the two years, amounted to 2,000—that is, 1,000 a year. The number of agrarian crimes for the five years of Lord Salisbury's ministry, from 1887 to 1891, amounted to 3,068, or an average of only 613 a year.

In the year 1881, Mr. Gladstone's second year of office, there were 4,439 agrarian crimes in Ireland. In the year 1886, when the Unionist party gained a clear majority, there were 1,056 agrarian crimes. In the year 1891, after Lord Salisbury and Mr. Balfour had been in power for five years, there were only 472 agrarian crimes, a smaller number than in any year since 1878.

The number of evictions also greatly decreased under the Unionist Government. In 1882, when Mr. Gladstone was in office, they amounted to 5,201; in 1886, when the Unionist party came into power, to 3,781; and in 1891, the last complete year of Lord Salisbury's administration, they had fallen to 991. In the five Gladstonian years from 1882 to 1886 there were no less than 19,940 evictions. In the five years from 1887 to 1891, when Mr. Balfour was responsible for the Government of Ireland, there were only 11,223 evictions, and quite half of these were due to the Plan of Campaign. There were 4,900 persons boycotted in Ireland when Lord Salisbury took office in 1886. When he left office in August, 1892, there was not a single person boycotted in the whole of Ireland. A great many false statements have been made with regard to Mr. Balfour's Criminal Law and Procedure Act of 1887, the so-called Coercion Act. As a matter of fact, *the total number of persons* proceeded against under the Criminal Law and Procedure Act, from the date of its passing to the 31st March, 1892, *was* 3,775, of whom 1,047 were discharged, and 2,728 convicted. In 671 cases the defendants were ordered to find sureties or enter into recognisances for their good behaviour, and the numbers of individuals who were imprisoned under the Act to the 31st March, 1892, *was only* 1,884. *The highest penalty which can be inflicted under the Act is six months imprisonment*, and *only* 181 *persons were sentenced to more than three months' imprisonment*, while 1,099, or considerably more than half the total number imprisoned, were sentenced for *terms not exceeding one month.*

So successful was the operation of this Act that, when the Unionist Government left office in August last year, there were only three persons in prison under it, and the Act was only in operation in County Clare. The Royal Irish Constabulary were also reduced in numbers by the Unionist Government by between three and four hundred. The average number of Irish police employed during the five Gladstonian years, from 1881 to 1885, was 14,602. The average number during the five Unionist years from 1886 to 1890, was 13,948. It is idle, therefore, to talk about Ireland "groaning under Coercion."

Mr. Gladstone in 1881 arrested and imprisoned over a thousand

persons without trial. The separate Irish Parliament, which existed from 1782 to 1800, passed no less than 54 Coercion Acts.

There was practically no coercion when Lord Salisbury fell from power. The Unionist Government had proved that they could govern Ireland in peace and prosperity. Agrarian crime had been reduced to a minimum. There were fewer evictions, there were fewer police, there was far less coercion than under Mr. Gladstone. The material improvement of the Irish people had been promoted in every possible way. Light Railways Acts, Drainage Acts, Public Works and Relief Acts, Irish Land Acts, and Land Purchase Acts (the Ashbourne Act and the Great Land Purchase Scheme of 1891) had all been successfully passed and put into operation. Ireland in 1892 was peaceful, prosperous, and contented. There was no real cause for, and no practical demand for, a separate Irish Parliament.

There is very little excitement even among the Nationalist Irish over the Home Rule Bill; and at the last election in July the Unionist members for Ireland were increased by five, two of whom came from the metropolitan district of Dublin. There is very little enthusiasm in Scotland over the Home Rule Bill; and England actually sent a majority of seventy-one members in opposition to it.

I.—IMPERIAL UNITY DESTROYED.

Vide pp. 88-9.

First of all let us take the question of the maintenance of Imperial unity. How can Mr. Gladstone pretend that the creation of a separate Parliament to control Irish affairs, with a quasi-independent Viceroy, who is to be appointed for six years, and who is to possess all the powers of the Crown, is consistent with Imperial unity? This separate Parliament is soon to have full control over the Irish judges, magistrates, and the Irish police, and, after three years, over the Irish land. It is a Parliament which is certain to demand fresh privileges and fresh powers, until it achieves entire independence. Is there an instance in the history of the whole world in which such autonomy and such a separate legislature have not resulted in complete separation and entire independence? The history of Turkey is full of warning. Similar autonomy was given first to Servia, then to Roumania, then to Bulgaria and Roumelia. Servia and Roumania are now independent kingdoms. Bulgaria enjoys practical independence, and might at any moment break the slender thread of suzerainty that binds her to Turkey. The dual Government and Parliaments existing in Austria-Hungary are only held together by the overmastering dread of the Russian Power felt by the Hungarians.

and by the dread of German ascendancy felt by the Austrian Slavs. Of all the great Powers Austria is the weakest, because of her separatist tendencies. The recent history of the United States of America contains a very suggestive lesson for this country. Thirty years ago a large portion, "the Southern States," endeavoured to assert and extend the principle of "State Rights" or Separation. The American people had to go through all the sacrifices and all the sufferings of a terrific civil war to maintain their unity. Mr. Gladstone was at that time in favour of Separation for the United States, just as he is now in favour of Separation for the United Kingdom. The majority of the American people rejected his policy then, and, after a struggle of five years, established their national unity on a secure basis.

Mr. Gladstone laid much stress upon the reference to the supremacy of Parliament in the preamble of the Bill, and Sir Edward Clarke, in his speech in the House of Commons on February 13th, 1893, pointed out the comparative futility of such a mere verbal mention of the subject:—

"To a mere lawyer this suggestion of the sacredness of a preamble is certainly a novelty. ("Hear, hear," and laughter.) I think I can see the reason why this subject has been transferred to the preamble. If the Nationalist members are satisfied with the clauses in the Bill they will not take much trouble about the preamble. (Hear, hear.) If the subject were embodied in the clauses of the Bill it would have to be discussed and considered by the House, whereas, if it is put in a few words in the preamble, it may be shuffled through the House without any one taking much notice of it, or anybody conceiving himself much bound by it. ("Hear, hear," and laughter.)"

DANGER FROM IRISH AUTONOMY.

Vide pp 91 to 96.

It is very easy at present to keep the disloyal and independent tendencies of the Celtic Irish within bounds, for the whole Administration of Ireland is in the hands of Imperial officials. The judges, the constabulary, the civil servants are all directly under the Sovereign, the Imperial Cabinet, and the Imperial Parliament. But under the new Bill the whole of the Irish Administration will be transferred from loyal to disloyal hands. The Sextons, O'Briens, Dillons, and Healys, who have on a thousand occasions boasted of, and have often practically shown, their hatred for England, will then be masters of Ireland. They will never rest till they have an armed force at their backs. Even if they wished otherwise, there will be behind them the darker and more dangerous spirits across the Atlantic, who have been so far the instigators and paymasters of the Nationalist movement, and who only care for total independence. The aim of these men has been, as Mr. William O'Brien has said, "That Ireland should be free, owning no flag but the green flag of an

independent Irish nation." Mr. T. Healy said, "Never have the hopes of the Irish people for *independence* been more likely than now to be accomplished."

Mr. Brennan, the Secretary of the Land League, and one of the most powerful in the band of Irish-American conspirators, said in 1885:—

"I ask you to keep before your minds the one ultimate object—*the sovereign independence of your country*. It is the duty of every man to work to make Ireland a nation. I mean no mockery of freedom. I mean *Ireland mistress of her own destinies—Ireland with a national army to guard her shores*, Ireland with a national senate, and Ireland with a National Government that will know no higher authority than the sovereign will of the Irish people."

Even if the present anti-Parnellite majority in Ireland were sincere in their pretence of accepting Mr. Gladstone's scheme as a final settlement, they would never be allowed to do so. There would always be other and more daring factions ready to press forward the quasi-moderate party into extreme courses. Every Irish Administration will be bound to seek popularity by some fresh demand and some fresh assault upon Imperial control.

TEST OF IMPERIAL UNITY.

Mr. Chamberlain, in examining whether the new "Home Rule" Bill preserves Imperial unity, as asserted by Mr. Gladstone, gave the following definition of Imperial unity:—"The test of Imperial unity is that the central authority shall have for all purposes of offence and defence full control of all the forces and all the resources of a country in which that unity applies." This is a fair definition; and tested by it there is full Imperial unity in the United Kingdom as at present. The Imperial Parliament can, if it chooses, spend the last penny and call out the last man in the United Kingdom. The unity of England to India is not so perfect. It is questionable whether, in case of war, the monetary resources of India could be used for the defence of this country. It is probable, however, that if hard pressed we should not hesitate to make use of the military forces of India.

In the case of the relations between the colonies and the parent country, the unity is of the slenderest character. There is little more than the link of the Crown. The Imperial Parliament has no right to exact from the colonies a single pound in taxation or a single man for military service. There can be no real analogy between our relations with the colonies and the relations between Ireland and Great Britain. The loss of any colony is to be deeply deplored, but in no single case would the loss of a colony inflict an irreparable injury upon this country.

STRATEGICAL VALUE OF IRELAND.

Our self-governing colonies are thousands of miles away, and their geographical position, if they became quite independent, would not threaten the internal safety or the naval supremacy of England. The island of Ireland, on the other hand, has been placed by nature so close to Great Britain, and in such a position of geographical, political, and strategical importance with regard to the sister-island, as to make it of vital interest to this country that Ireland should never fall under hostile control. It is easy enough to control Ireland while all the officials, civil and military, are appointed by, and are under the orders of, the Imperial Government. If, on the other hand, Ireland had a separate Parliament with a separate Administration, controlled by men who would most certainly, in almost any dispute, show a marked hostility to Great Britain and to British interests, it would be easy for an enemy to obtain great influence in Ireland. It would not be difficult for an enemy even to send an armed force to that country for the harassing and possibly for the invasion of England. Once the Irish have a separate Parliament, they would inevitably demand the right to establish an armed force of militia or volunteers.

CRIPPLING THE IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT.

Let Englishmen consider what the position of their country then would be at a great national crisis. There would be eighty unscrupulous Irish members harassing the Government and the Imperial Parliament, and these guerillas would probably be backed up by 100,000 armed and disciplined Irish troops. By the votes of the eighty Irish Members in the Imperial Parliament our Foreign Policy might be paralysed by the refusal of supplies, or by the overthrow, at a critical juncture, of a British Ministry.

REPEAL OF THE UNION.

This measure really means the repeal of the Union It is nonsense for Mr. Gladstone and his followers to speak of it as preserving Imperial unity, and still greater nonsense for them to describe it as "intensifying unity." The Act of Union between Great Britain and Ireland established by Mr. Pitt in 1802 was not a union of *Sovereignty*. It was essentially a union of *Parliaments*. The union of the Crowns has existed for 700 years—ever since Ireland was conquered by Henry II. The words of the Act of Union makes this clear:—"That it be a third article of the

vide pp. 88-9.

"Act of Union that the said United Kingdom be represented in "*one and the same Parliament*, to be styled the Parliament of "the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland." The formation of this one united Parliament was the essence of the Act of Union. It is that one Imperial Parliament which Mr. Gladstone proposes now to break up and destroy, and it is consequently absurd to speak of his scheme or Bill as maintaining Imperial unity.

THE UNION WAS NECESSARY.

Vide "Irish Horrors" pp. 169 to 170, and Appendix V.

Many misrepresentations and absurdities are talked about the causes of the Union and the methods by which it was accomplished. The Union was an absolute necessity, brought about by the desperate condition into which Ireland had fallen under the separate Parliament, known as Grattan's Parliament, which lasted from 1782 to 1800. Ireland was in a helpless condition of financial, political and social ruin at that time. She was torn by racial and religious animosities. Her treasury was bankrupt, a great portion of her people were in a state of frenzied rebellion. The most horrible massacres and atrocities had been committed by the Roman Catholic revolutionists upon their Protestant fellow-countrymen. An army of French Republicans had been invited over to assist the Irish Rebellion against Great Britain, and a considerable French force had actually landed on Irish soil. Fortunately the bulk of the French expedition had been scattered by the winds; otherwise the most serious danger would have been created for England. The Irish separate Parliament of 1782 to 1800 could never be relied upon to properly safeguard the Irish coast and people from foreign invasion. The same danger would soon be found to exist under a new Irish Parliament, with this difference, that steam has now annihilated the protecting power of the winds and waves, and that a French army could be thrown in a very few hours time upon the Irish Coast. Moreover, Great Britain is at present dependent for her food supplies upon foreign corn and foreign meat. The strategical position of Irish harbours, and their occupation by a French fleet, would enable a Franco-Irish combination, in the event of a reverse to our Navy, to close both the English and St. George's Channels against our men-of-war and our merchantmen. Such a catastrophe might inflict starvation and ruin upon England.

II.—EQUALITY BETWEEN THE KINGDOMS.

As for Mr. Gladstone's second and third conditions—the equality of all the kingdoms, and the equal repartition of Imperial charges, no such principles are to be found in Mr.

Gladstone's present Bill. The Irish are to have a separate Parliament of their own to deal with their own local affairs, and they are also to send eighty members to constantly harass, and, on most questions, to control the Imperial Parliament. It is not proposed to give any such separate Parliaments or any such special powers to England, Scotland and Wales.

The Irish are to be free from interference on the part of the British people in the Irish Parliament and in Irish affairs. But the Imperial Parliament is to be at the mercy of a guerilla band of eighty Irish members, who, even Mr. Gladstone confessed, would be open to perpetual intrigue, and who would probably be at the disposal of the highest bidder. How absurd, then, to talk about equality between the three kingdoms!

III.—"EQUITABLE REPARTITION OF FINANCE."

As to "the equitable repartition of Imperial charges," Mr. Gladstone proposes to lower the contribution of Ireland to one-twenty-fifth. The Irish, numbering one-eighth of the population of the United Kingdom, are to have almost an eighth of the total representation in the Imperial Parliament, but are, according to Mr. Gladstone's speech of February 13th, only to pay one-twenty-fifth of the cost of administering Imperial affairs. The Irish are to send eighty members to the Imperial Parliament, which is their just proportion according to population, but they are only to pay towards Imperial charges £2,370,000 a year, which is barely one-third of what their share of Imperial charges should be according to their population, and according to their proposed representation of eighty members in the Imperial Parliament. Why should there be this difference? If the Irish are unable to pay their proper share of the Imperial charges, surely they have no right to so large a representation as eighty members of the Imperial Parliament. The Irish members contend that even a twenty-fifth is too much for Ireland to pay, on the ground that England is more than twenty-five times as rich as Ireland. The truth is that the scheme is full of inequalities, and in every detail favours the disloyal Irish at the expense of the loyal people of Great Britain and Ireland. Under Mr. Gladstone's Bill, the share of Imperial charges borne by Ireland will come to as nearly as possible 10s. per head of the population. The share of the English, Scotch and Welsh, on the other hand, will be £1 13s. 4d. per head. Is this Mr. Gladstone's idea of an "equality between all the kingdoms," and of an "equitable repartition of financial burdens?"

Vide pp. 97 to 102.

The financial arrangements are both complicated and excessively favourable to Ireland. To start with, a surplus of £500,000 a year is to be given to the Irish Parliament. That is equal to a capital sum of £17,000,000. Why is this great present to be made to a semi-independent Ireland? What have the Irish Nationalists done to deserve it? What benefit will the bonus of £500,000, which has to come out of the pockets of British taxpayers, confer upon the British people? How much better it would be that this sum should be spent in conferring some boon upon the agricultural labourers of England, or upon the artisans of our towns. As Mr. Balfour, on February 14th, well said:—

"The only explanation is, as Mr. Gladstone says, that we have "been engaged in a contest with the forces of lawlessness and "disorder, but we have been beaten in that contest, and, "according to Mr. Gladstone, *a war indemnity* is now exacted "from us." The English people will object to pay that war indemnity, and do not admit that they have been beaten in the contest.

The arrangement for collecting the Income Tax in Ireland will also be very difficult. The Customs duties are raised mainly on tobacco and tea. The entire share to be paid by Ireland towards Imperial charges is to come from the Customs, which are to be collected by Imperial officers. What is to happen if these Customs duties were to be lowered or abolished? Many persons advocate a free breakfast table. If these Customs duties are lowered by the aid of the 80 Irish representatives, the Irish contribution to Imperial charges will be correspondingly reduced. The Temperance party will, no doubt, be pleased to know that the Irish Budget depends mainly on Excise, that is, on whiskey. It is a Whiskey Budget; and if through temperance legislation the revenue from Irish Excise should be diminished, the British taxpayer will have to make up the loss to the Irish Exchequer. As Mr. Goschen said on February 17th:—

"Of the total £5,660,000, £3,200,000 are excise; and nearly the whole of the excise consists of duties paid upon spirits. The consequence will be this, that the people *of Ireland will know that, when they consume tea and tobacco they are paying tribute, as it will be called, to Great Britain, but whisky-drinkers will be supporting the national finances.* (Laughter.) It was Mr. Redmond who said in his very able speech, 'We have a balance now of £500,000, but we depend mainly on the excise.' What is, then, to happen if the excise should fail? Why, certainly, the surplus will vanish. The budget of Ireland, as reconstructed, will simply depend upon the consumption of whisky by the people."

The financial proposals of the Bill, under which the Customs are to be collected by Imperial officers, but the Income Tax, the Excise, and other taxes are to be collected and disposed of by the officers of the Irish Parliament, are sufficiently confusing.

Lord Randolph Churchill, in his able speech, on February 16th, quoted an interesting statement sent him by an eminent City financier, who is understood to be Lord Rothschild. The following is the extract:—

As to the proposals for the disposal of the Irish taxes, they are certainly new when emanating from an English Government, but otherwise there is nothing in them very novel, although in the countries in which they have been tried they have had but a very qualified success. (Laughter.) I may cite the Argentine Confederation—(laughter)—where the Central Government keeps the Customs and allows the Provincial Governments to appropriate the same as Mr. Gladstone proposes giving to Ireland. As may be supposed, the provinces, released from central control, squander their money, and when the members of the Provincial Governments take their seats in the Central Assembly they steadily refuse to vote anything the nation requires until large subsidies in some shape or other are made to the Provincial Assemblies, with such a result that bankruptcy, I suppose, has never been spelt in bigger letters. (Cheers and laughter.)

Under our present financial system all estimates—English, Scotch, and Irish—are voted on by the whole House. If Irish opposition to expenditure for the benefit of Great Britain becomes unreasonable, English members can retaliate by threatening to reduce grants to Ireland; but by this Bill the Irish will retain large powers to obstruct English votes, whilst Englishmen are no longer allowed the right to keep any check on Irish expenditure.

It is noticeable that the Irish Nationalists are complaining that Mr. Gladstone has of recent years been the means of making the Irish people pay more than their due proportion of taxation by increasing the duty on whisky from 2s. 8d. to 10s. Whisky is the Irish national beverage, and the duty has been nearly trebled. Beer, they say, is the English national beverage, and the duty on beer has been only slightly increased. The result is that, while in Ireland, in 1853, a population of over 6,000,000 drank 7,500,000 gallons of whisky, and paid Excise duty of £1,000,000 for it; in Ireland now, 4,700,000 people drink 4,500,000 gallons, but pay a duty of £2,250,000, that is 225 per cent. more than Ireland paid 40 years ago. The Nationalists also state that while the taxation of England, with her increasing population and accumulating wealth, has only increased 17 per cent. in 40 years, the general taxation of Ireland has increased 52 per cent. They argue that Ireland, whose taxable resources are only 1-35th of the taxable resources of Great Britain, should only contribute £2,500,000 out of £90,000,000 to the Imperial Budget, whereas she now contributes £8,000,000 to it.

These statistics, of course, require careful verification An

obvious answer is that if Ireland feels herself so over-taxed, she has no right to a representation of nearly one-sixth in the Imperial Parliament, which she now possesses, or of nearly one-eighth which she would have under Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule scheme.

The Nationalists also contend that much of the Customs duties to be assigned to the Imperial Exchequer are raised on goods brought to Ireland in bond, on which the duty has already been paid in England. Thus, most of the tea and tobacco brought into Ireland have already had the duty paid in England, as well as beer, coffee, cocoa, raisins, etc. The Nationalists contend that under this arrangement Ireland really pays 50 per cent. more than Mr. Gladstone admits, because the articles consumed in Ireland will contribute nothing to the Irish Exchequer.

The *Irish Times*, a leading Irish journal, opportunely reminds the Nationalist party that the surplus of £500,000 under the "Home Rule" Bill would be a very poor substitute for the help Ireland has so liberally received from the Imperial Exchequer. We quote from the *Irish Times* of February 16th :—

"Even Mr. Sexton cannot answer, if we remind him that bounties to encourage Irish industries, which it is hinted are contemplated, would make a big hole in the half million every year, leaving nothing for seasons of exceptional pressure or calamity. From the Imperial resources we were always in a position to expect assistance. Is it forgotten that hardly two years ago Mr. Balfour gave to Ireland considerably over half a million to build railways in the West, not to mention other large amounts? And does the M'Carthyite eulogist of Mr. Gladstone fail to remember that since 1870 no less than seven millions have been expended on Irish objects, which can never be available again from any Irish source? The new Bill would wall us in financially, removing from our purely local store and circumscribed resources nearly a Two-Million-and-a-Half Tribute (£2,370,000)."

THE TOTAL IMPERIAL CHARGES.

As to the discrepancy in his figures for the amount of Imperial charges, Mr. Gladstone, replying to Mr. Goschen on Feb. 23rd, said :—

"The estimate of £59,000,000 represents the probable net expenditure in the current financial year. The figure quoted by the right hon. gentleman, £63,352,000, is the estimated gross expenditure for 1891-2, and it is subject to the following principal reductions. First of all, the receipts which may be classified as Imperial are £1,616,000 in excess. Next, the actual issues for 1891-2 were less than was anticipated by £490,000. Next, the cost of the Yeomanry and Volunteers, which may be considered a British force, is taken at £1,000,000. Next, the year 1891-2 contained an extraordiaary charge for coinage of £400,000 ; and, fifthly and lastly, the remaining difference is due to the fact that the figures relate to different years, and also that it was thought right to make certain alterations in the scheme produced in the Bill."

THE TWO BUDGETS.

The subjoined Tables show a full comparison between the financial proposals of the Bills of 1886 and 1893 :—

PROPOSALS OF 1886.

EXPENDITURE.

	£	£
1.—National Debt ...	1,466,000	
2.—Sinking Fund ...	360,000	
		1,826,000
3.—Army and Navy ...		1,666,000
4.—Civil Service		110,000
5.—Collection, Customs and Excise		247,000
		3,849,000
6.—*Constabulary ...		1,000,000
7.—Irish Civil Service, &c.		2,510,000
8.—Collection of Revenue		587,000
Total		7,946,000
Surplus		404,000
		£8,350,000

* A saving on the Constabulary charge would only take effect after the whole expenditure on the Constabulary had been reduced to a million; all previous savings would go to the reduction merely of the portion borne by Great Britain.

REVENUE (1886).

	£
1.—Customs	1,880,000
2.—†Excise	4,300,000
3.—Income Tax	550,000
4.—Stamp Duties	600,000
5.—Non-Tax Revenue (Postal, Crown Lands, and Miscellaneous) ...	1,020,000
Total	£8,350,000

† N.B.—This item included £1,400,000 of Excise really paid for by the English consumer, which £1,400,000 under the Bill of 1886 was left with the Irish Exchequer, but which under the Bill of 1893 is given to the Imperial Exchequer.

In 1886 there was an item of £360,000 for Sinking Fund, which does not appear in the Irish Budget of 1893.

PROPOSALS OF 1893.

EXPENDITURE.

	£
1.—Civil Government Charges (exclusive of Constabulary, &c., Charge and Salary of Lord Lieutenant, but inclusive of Local Charges met out of Local Taxation Revenue)	3,210,000
2.—Collection of Inland Revenue ...	160,000
3.—Postal Services ...	790,000
4.—*Contribution to Imperial Constabulary, &c.	1,000,000
Total	5,160,000
Surplus	500,000
	£5,560,000

* Ireland is to bear two-thirds (£1,000,000) of the Constabulary expenditure, amounting in all to £1,500,000 a year, and Great Britain the remaining one-third (£500,000). As savings are effected in the cost of the force, these will benefit Ireland to the extent of two-thirds and Great Britain to the extent of one-third.

REVENUE (1893.)

		£
1.—‡Excise, contributed by Ireland (exclusive of Licenses)		3,220,000
2.—Local Taxes:		
(*a*) Stamp Duties ...	£750,000	
(*b*) Income Tax (at 6d.)...	550,000	
(*c*) Excise Licenses ...	190,000	
		1,495,000
3.—Postal Revenue	Non-Tax	740,000
4.—Crown Lands ...	Non-Tax	65,000
5.—Miscellaneous Revenue ...	Non-Tax	140,000
Total		£5,660,000

‡ The Customs Duties, amounting to over £2,370,000, are to be collected, as now, by Imperial officers, and paid, as now, into the Imperial Exchequer as Ireland's contribution to Imperial expenditure. It amounts to about one-twenty-fifth of the total Imperial charges.

There is likely to be serious trouble over the Excise duties, amounting to over £1,400,000, in reality paid by British consumers, which have been, however, collected in Ireland. This £1,400,000, in his Bill of 1886, gave to the Irish Exchequer, and fixed their Imperial contribution at £3,602,000, plus £360,000 for a Sinking Fund. In the present Bill Mr. Gladstone takes this £1,400,000 for the Imperial Exchequer, and fixes the Irish Imperial contribution at only £2,370,000. Mr. Parnell severely criticised Mr. Gladstone's proposal in 1886, and the present Parnellite party are now strongly pushing Mr. Parnell's view. Thus Mr. Pierce Mahony, February 28th, 1893, quoted with approbation Mr. Parnell's speech, as follows:—

"'The right hon. gentleman has indeed explained that if we were to insist on a separate Custom House that England could deprive Ireland, by collecting in Ireland the duties on whisky and tobacco, of £1,400,000 a year. This would be a serious matter, and it may be fairly balanced against the control of the Customs and the Excise. But if the Prime Minister is to claim credit for giving us £1,400,000 in lieu of the retention of the Customs; then the Imperial authority cannot claim credit for it over again. If this £1,400,000 was offered to Ireland, as it was offered in 1886, in return for her giving up the right which every colonial legislature possesses—the right to impose duties on foreign importations—if Ireland gives up that right in consideration of maintaining absolute free trade between England and Ireland to get this £1,400,000 a year thereby, no Prime Minister representing England has a right to claim credit for that money over again in some other form. That is to say, if you fix upon a certain sum as Ireland's proper contribution to the Imperial expenses, that sum is to be paid quite irrespective of, and without any consideration whatever, of this £1,400,000, which comes to Ireland in a totally different way, namely, in return for her giving up her right to erect Custom Houses in Ireland.' And, Mr. Mahony added, that was Mr. Parnell's view in 1886, and it is the view Irish Nationalists should take at the present moment; but it is not the view taken by Mr. Gladstone in his Home Rule Bill. Without apology, Mr. Gladstone congratulates the British House of Commons that in 1893 he is able to take from Ireland £1,400,000, which in 1886 he said distinctly could not be taken from Ireland if you were to keep up free trade between the two countries."

PROBABLE BANKRUPTCY.

The demands which are likely to be made, and at a very early date, upon the Irish surplus, are well pointed out by an article in the *Birmingham Post* of March 2nd, 1893:—

vide pp. 55-6.

"While the outlook for Great Britain is thus over-clouded, that for the Irish Government is not much more encouraging. Mr. Gladstone assumes that from the sources of revenue handed over—chiefly the Excise duties—there will be a surplus of £500,000 at the disposal of the Nationalist administration. But this balance, which is an estimate only, will soon be swallowed up, even if it is realised. New places will be created, fresh demands for public works, railways, roads, harbours, etc., will arise; ordinary costs of administration will sure to grow, for there will be no permanent Imperial officials competent to enforce economy. And suppose that a succession of bad seasons occurs, or that political trouble grows out of the strife of contending Nationalists, or from the refusal of Ulster to submit to Nationalist domination—what then becomes of the finances of the Irish Government? Or, again, what will happen if the excise on whisky falls below its present amount?

This is not a fanciful suggestion, for the yield of this excise has been steadily dropping for some years past. As the main source of revenue consists of the whisky duty, a further drop in the yield will reduce the Irish Government to a state of practical bankruptcy. How is this to be met? By loans? Hardly, for capital is alarmed already, and will be withdrawn rather than further advanced. By appeals to British assistance? Scarcely, for under the most favourable conditions we shall have to pay heavily in order to give Ireland a practically independent Government, and British taxpayers, smarting under this infliction, will not be likely to assume a further burden because Ireland cannot manage her Government when she has got it. Then there is but one resource to avoid bankruptcy, and that is taxation."

Some of the shrewder Nationalists are already beginning to see that the surplus of £500,000 offered them in Mr. Gladstone's new Irish Budget will not go very far to meet the loss and injustice that will be inflicted by the Home Rule Bill. Thus *United Ireland* of March 4, 1893, says:—

"It may, of course, be argued that the Imperial police force will be placed under a process of reduction from the very beginning. Let us, for the moment, concede this: what then? Why then the Irish Treasury will have *to pay the police pensions thus arising in each case, we believe, two-thirds of the full pay.* Let us take the very exceptional case of all the Imperial police resigning within two years, and consider the position so created. The Irish Treasury would find that it had to pay in pensions nearly £700,000 a year, and that it had also to support a civil force costing £600,000 a year. Here would be a certain inroad of £300,000 a year on the supposed surplus.

"But this does not exhaust the responsibilities of the belated half million. What about the pensions to Judges and Civil Servants? These must be paid ultimately by the Irish Exchequer. If all the present Judges and Civil Servants agree to remain at their posts, there will be no further charge than is provided for in the Budget we have quoted; but it is almost certain that a large number of the present servants of the Crown in connection with the Law and the Civil Service will take advantage of the pensions provisions of the Bill. To illustrate this point it is only necessary to take one item. The salaries of the greater and lesser *Irish Judges*, according to the return already referred to, amounts to £109,500 a year. Supposing half these decided to resign after Home Rule is passed, the *Irish Exchequer would be saddled with nearly £40,000 a year in pensions*, in addition to the salaries of the new judges who would have to be appointed in their places. But this is a very small part of the question. After the judges come the officers of the Local Government Board (which cost £133,550 per annum), the Public Works Office (£33,500), the Registrar-General's Office (£20,000), the Valuation Office (£12,000), the Land Commission (£73,500), County Court Officers (£115,000), and Education (over £1,000,000). With even 10 per cent. of resignations in these various offices it is quite reasonable to suppose that within two years of its establishment *the Irish Parliament would be saddled with a pension list of between £100,000 and £150,000 a year.*"

The Irish are already beginning to object to the collection in England, as proposed by Mr. Gladstone, of the Irish Excise Duties paid by British consumers. The *Freeman's Journal* of February 28th, 1893, says:—

"The clause of the Home Rule Bill providing for the collection in England of the duty to be paid on excisable articles exported from Ireland to England is exciting considerable anxiety among the wholesale whisky traders in Dublin and Belfast. In cases where the export is to owners of bond stores the charge makes no serious difference. But the dealing is largely with smaller traders and consumers who prefer to deal directly with the Irish houses, as the most certain way of securing

the Irish spirits which are coming largely into favour. Any interference with the direct dealing either by lessening the ease or readiness of the transaction, or by compelling the English vendors to get their goods through English bonded stores, would, it is felt, seriously injure this branch of Irish trade, which has been steadily growing for some time past. The matter deserves attention and discussion."

IV.—THE PROTECTION OF MINORITIES.

As to the fourth principle, the protection of minorities, Mr. Gladstone made hardly any reference to Ulster throughout his speech. In 1886, Parliament and the country were led to believe that Mr. Gladstone would welcome any improvement in his then Bill that would give a guarantee of safety for person and property to the Loyalists, and especially to the loyal Protestants of Ulster. This wide-spread impression induced many English electors, and especially Nonconformist electors, to give a general support to Mr. Gladstone's "Home Rule" scheme. The present Bill does not contain the slightest attempt to protect the loyal minority in Ulster, unless, indeed, the "Council" or Upper Chamber should be so considered. But that Council is an Elective Council, to consist of only forty-eight members, chosen by electors holding property of over £20 rateable value. When the Council differs from the Legislative Assembly, which is to consist of 103 members, the two chambers are to meet together and decide the issue by joint voting. There are only twenty-two loyalist members for Ireland. If the whole of the forty-eight members of the Council were to unite with the twenty-two Loyalists in such a vote, they would still be in a minority of eleven (only 70 to 81), and would be completely overborne.

But throughout the South and West of Ireland there "is little chance" that even the members of the Council will be anything but Nationalists of the extreme type. No elector, once Home Rule is established, will in the South and West of Ireland dare cast his vote against the dominant faction. There is, therefore, no practical protection for the Irish Loyalists, even in the so-called "Council." If the Irish people were fairly represented according to population, Ulster would have thirty-five members, and the Loyalists, who number at least a third of the population, could be able to return 30 members out of 103, instead of only 22 as at present. But under this Bill the inequalities of the present system are stereotyped, and no amendment of the Irish representation is allowed for six years.

Colonel Saunderson, in his eloquent speech on February 13th, made it plain that the Irish Loyalists in the last resort would rely upon their own strong arms to defend themselves, and that

they were quite able to hold their own. The English people, who even at the last election returned for England a majority of seventy-one members against separation, will never consent to allow English troops to be employed against the Loyalists of Ireland.

Although Mr. Bryce made the following promise in his speech in the House of Commons on February 14th, 1893,

"We are aware of the obligations which Imperial legislation has imposed upon us in their (the constabulary) regard, and we propose to abide by those obligations. The same remarks apply to the Civil servants and the Judges. We recognise our liability to make provision for them, and we have satisfied that liability."

Yet it is clear that the Bill itself by no means properly protects the great mass of the existing Civil servants in Ireland. Certain of the higher officials are undoubtedly well provided for, but the great mass of the permanent Civil servants, the persons on whom the weight of administration and obloquy has fallen, are almost literally thrown to the wolves. Under sections 28, on the passing of the Act, six months' notice may be served on any or all of them by the Irish Government, and men who have entered into the service of the Crown, believing in the justice of England, will be expelled from their offices to make room for hungry aspirants whose main passport to office will be their past disloyalty to that Crown they are now ready to serve for a consideration.

NO SECURITY FOR PERSONS.

There is but little provision in the Bill for the protection of personal freedom. Mr. Chamberlain pointed out with great force that under the "Plan of Campaign," but for the fact that the Imperial Government and Imperial officials in Ireland, backed by all the resources of the police and the judiciary, were able to protect the landowners and their agents, every landowner in Ireland might have been easily ruined. Under a separate Irish Parliament, the Nationalist majority, led by men like Mr. William O'Brien, Mr. Dillon, and Mr. Healy, will refuse police protection to the landowners, bailiffs, and caretakers, and to the new tenants who may have taken the place of those who refused to pay their just rent. The result will be that the lives of the landowners and of those who work with them will not be worth an hour's purchase.

There have been cases in which Boards of Guardians have administered relief at the expense of the ratepayers for purely political purposes, in order to help evicted tenants and others who had no real claim for such relief. They have given as much as 20s. a week out-door relief to persons in possession

of hay and other property. The Local Government Board has in consequence dissolved several of their corrupt and illegally-acting Boards of Guardians, and appointed paid guardians to carry out their work. In 1886 one Board of Guardians distributed the relief money Mr. Morley sent to them to over 300 more persons than there were inhabitants in the whole Poor-law Union. When the relieving officer was asked by the Committee of Enquiry from whence he got the names of the surplus 300, he replied—"from the gravestones in the church-yard." Under a separate Irish Parliament these Boards of Guardians would undoubtedly be allowed to do just as they please. The only remedy offered in the Bill for any person, who is wronged in his person or in his property by the deliberate action or the deliberate neglect of the Irish Parliament, is an appeal to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. What likelihood is there that an Irish tenant, farmer, or bailiff, or policeman, or labourer, who may have offended the local Nationalist authority, would be able to come to London and bear all the expense of an appeal to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council? The idea is absurd. A large landowner might indeed find such an appeal possible, but what fruit would it bear, even if the appellant were successful and obtained judgment in his favour? Every Irish official will be appointed by, and be in the hands of, the Nationalist majority, who will control the new Irish Parliament. There is not the slightest doubt as to this.

It is very interesting to note that the Parnellite minority of the Nationalist party are themselves in great terror of being oppressed under the new Irish Parliament. A Parnellite writes in the Dublin *Evening Herald* of February 25th, 1893 :—

"What are the spoils? And who are the hungry claimants? I proceed to answer. When the Home Rule Bill has become law the present Irish representation in Westminster will at once cease, and a new General Election will be held in Ireland, first, for the reduced number of Irish Imperial members, and secondly, for 103 members of the Legislative Assembly. Every inducement which avarice and malice can supply to the clericals, both lay and ecclesiastical, will then be in full operation to effect the annihilation of the Parnellite representation in the Legislature. I state the prospect boldly. *The priests will be glad to wreak vengeance on us. They have been insolent and ruthless to Parnellites since the secession wherever chastisement or contumely might be inflicted.* Big salaries will be attached to the Ministry, and salaries will be attached also to all the under officials in the new *régime*. They see the almost immediate possibility of stretching out their hands and clutching numerous offices ranging in annual value from £1,500 to £150. Take a subsidised McCarthyite, receiving now £100 or £200 per annum, with precarious prospects from the Federation, and dangle before his eyes a Home Rule Government offer worth £400 or £500 or £800 per annum—and prospects. Is that likely to quicken his fancy for the Home Rule Bill, even with many imperfections? Perhaps the picture will be something like this—Executive Committee of Privy Council: Prime Minister and Secretary of State, Mr. Blake, £1,000; Minister of Finance, Mr. Sexton, £800; Minister of Public Works,

Mr. William O'Brien, £800; Minister of Agriculture, Mr. John Dillon, £800; Minister of Education, Mr. Tim Healy, £800; Post and Telegraphs, Mr. Davitt, £800; Local Government, Mr. T. D. Sullivan, £800; Lord Chancellor, the Right Hon. S. Walker, £8,000; Attorney-General, £5,000; Solicitor-General, £2,000; total, £20,800. Then will follow a host of Under-Secretaryships at £400, and a sufficient number of Departmental appointments to the extent required by members of the McCarthyite Party now in Parliament, raising the total from £20,800 to at least £30,000 per annum. Now, are not the spoils which the McCarthyite Party have in view worth fighting for? Again, these men will have unchecked control, constituting the Executive Government, over all the Parnellites in the country. The Veto, of which so much is said, affects only legislation. In executive action the Irish Government would be supreme. *If Parnellites are the victims of injustice or suffer ill-treatment, no satisfaction probably would be obtained from the McCarthyite Minister in power.* Now, I want to know, are Parnellites going to submit to this or to the possibility of it? The McCarthyite impecunious politicians, the priests, and the illiterates to govern Ireland, and to carve out the Civil List of salaries amongst themselves, and to lord it over 100,000 Parnellites who are free and independent men. If that is the game, the Liberal Government may make up their minds to see squalls in Ireland. The Bill, which does not guarantee the Parnellite a share in the Government to an extent that will secure the independent men of Ireland from being operated on in the spirit of the vindictive speeches that have been delivered against us by the Dillons and the O'Briens and the Healys and the Davitts, will not long stand against Parnellite indignation and resistance."

IMPOSSIBILITY OF REDRESS.

Let us suppose that a member of the Royal Irish Constabulary, who has been grievously wronged by some of the new Nationalist officials and refused redress by the Irish Nationalist Government, appeals to the Privy Council, and wins his case. Who is to enforce the decision of the court, and by what means are its decrees to be carried out? Let us suppose that the British Cabinet advise the Sovereign to instruct the Viceroy—(this is the process prescribed by the Bill)—to demand of the Irish Government and the Irish Parliament justice for the unfortunate Irish constable. The Irish Cabinet would probably refuse to do anything, and it would be backed up by the Nationalist majority in the Irish Parliament. Or, if the Irish Cabinet consented to carry out the decree of the Judical Committee of the Privy Council, it is ten to one that it would be turned out of office by the Irish Parliament. That being the case, a complete deadlock would be created. Either the Irish Cabinet would resign—and it is more than doubtful whether a new Irish Cabinet could be forced to carry out the behests of the English Judical Committee—or the English Cabinet, finding itself powerless to do justice and to carry out the decrees of its highest Court, would resign.

There is, indeed, a third course, which sooner or later—if Mr. Gladstone's Bill ever becomes law—is bound to be taken. For some time things will drift along. Irish Loyalists—landowners,

police, farmers and peasants—will be plundered, outraged and ruined. The British Government will be powerless to induce the Irish Government to give redress. Exasperation will steadily grow in the British Parliament and among the British people at this denial of justice and at this deadlock, until at last the armed forces of the Crown will be put into operation. Then the Irish Parliament, with all its injustice, inconsistencies and absurdities, will be swept away. That is the inevitable outcome of Mr. Gladstone s Home Rule scheme, which will probably be accompanied, or preceded, by a bloody insurrection and a desperate civil struggle in Ireland itself.

Vide pp 89-91.

V.—"A REAL AND CONTINUOUS SETTLEMENT."

What chance is there of this Bill being regarded as a final settlement? The questions that will arise with regard to the voting or not voting of the Irish contingent of eighty members to the Imperial Parliament are alone bristling with every kind of difficulty and dispute. But this subject is so full of monstrous complications that it demands separate and special treatment. "It passes the wit of man" to understand how Mr. Gladstone and his colleagues could ever have proposed such absurdities. All questions connected with the Crown, the Viceroyalty, peace and war, dignities and titles, foreign affairs, religious freedom and religious establishment, education and personal freedom, are distinctly excluded from the purview of the new Irish Parliament.

The Home Rule policy of Mr. Gladstone is most inconsistent. By it he encourages Irish nationality, and gives reality to a claim of the Irish Nationalists that Ireland is a separate and independent nation, and not, as the Unionists affirm, part of the one great nation forming the United Kingdom. Mr. Gladstone has in his speeches spoken of British rule, British law, and British interests as "foreign" to those of Ireland. Yet, while admitting the claim of Ireland to be a nation, the new Bill deprives it of some of the most cherished privileges of independent nations. Thus it deprives Ireland of the right of having any dealings with, other nations. It deprives Ireland of the right of dealing with its own religion and its own education. It deprives Ireland of the right of dealing with its own trade and customs as regards other nations. Such restrictions as these, though they may be quite justifiable under the circumstances of the case, must constitute causes of offence and dispute with Ireland, and must sow the seeds of future discontent. There is little chance that the

Bill will be a "permanent and continuing settlement." Even if the present Irish leaders genuinely accept it, they cannot possibly bind their successors.

Let us take four of these questions only—those of education, religious establishment, personal freedom, and an armed force. Does any sane man imagine that the new Irish Parliament, led by such men as Mr. Healy, Mr. Dillon, Mr. Sexton, and Mr. W. O'Brien, will ever be content to remain without the establishment of an armed force? Whether that force be called an "army," "militia," "volunteers," or armed "Gaelic clubs," it matters not. The Irish Parliament will insist upon the establishment of a disciplined and armed Irish force. Take the questions of religious establishment and education. The Roman Catholic hierarchy in Ireland has already attempted to get control of education. Already, as Mr. T. W. Russell said on Feb. 14, Archbishop Walsh has done his best behind the back of Parliament by a resolution of the National Board of Education to change the whole character of Irish education, and to put it upon sectarian, that is, upon Roman Catholic, lines. Is it likely that the new Irish Parliament, which will be entirely in the hands of the clerical party, will be satisfied to allow freedom of education and to leave the Roman Catholic Church without endowment? Take, again, the case of personal freedom. Is it probable that men who have for thirteen years regarded the murder of policemen and the shooting of landlords as good sport, will leave the Loyalists of Ireland with that freedom of person and property to which they have a right? Will they not immediately begin that system of prosecution and oppression and outrage, upon which the leaders of the Nationalist party have flourished for so many years?

Mr. Sexton showed how far the present scheme is from finality by entering an immediate protest against the financial proposals of Mr. Gladstone, most favourable though they are to Ireland. Mr. John Redmond pointed out many features of the Bill, notably that of the veto, which would not be acceptable to himself or his friends Is it not certain that every year will see increasing demand for fresh concessions and for greater independence made by the Irish Parliament, and that every ambitious politician in Ireland will seek to make capital out of the ever-welcome appeal to Celtic hatred of England? *The British Weekly*, February 16th, 1893, says:—

> The result will be that Liberals must secure a majority of more than eighty from England, Scotland and Wales before they are in anything like a safe position for the initiation of reform. Suppose that England, Scotland and Wales sent up a Liberal majority of, let us say, sixty. Suppose the Irish members came over to discuss the land question—and it is very certain that little else would be discussed

402202

for three years—and presented an ultimatum to the Liberals demanding a settlement on lines to which the Liberals could not agree. They would then immediately turn the Liberals out, so that a ministry in possession of a large majority of the House would be completely at the mercy of the Irish party, bound to do their bidding or go. What improbability there is in it lies in the very slender chance of an English, Scotch and Welsh majority of eighty votes being secured within a measureable time. The Welsh and Scotch are comforted by being told that they will have Home Rule measures also by-and-by. Who is to grant these measures? By what leverage are they to be achieved? And do Scotchmen and Welshmen wish to be in the same position towards the Imperial Parliament as the Irish will be if the new Bill is passed? These are very grave questions, and as at present advised we cannot but think that they make the future prospects of Liberal reform in this country gloomy in the extreme."

Mr. Gladstone has boasted on every occasion on which he has brought his Irish legislation before the House of Commons—in 1869, when he destroyed the Irish Church; in 1870, when he first attacked the Irish land owners; in 1881, when, by his Land Act, he set up the ruinous principle of dual ownership in Ireland—that each effort would be successful and would be final. Taught by bitter experience, on this last occasion, indeed, Mr. Gladstone eschewed the word "finality;" but what right has he to assume that there is in the present scheme the slightest elements of a "real and continuous settlement?" So much for his principle of finality or settlement.

OBSTRUCTION IN PARLIAMENT.

This Bill gives no relief to the Imperial Parliament. One of the principal arguments used in favour of Mr. Gladstone's Bill of 1886 was that by the exclusion of the Irish members the Imperial Parliament would be free from the harassing and endless discussion of Irish questions, and that the public time would thereby be greatly saved. Under the present Bill the eighty Irish members will practically control the Imperial legislature, as they will almost always hold the balance of power between the two parties. Irish questions will therefore continue to be discussed *ad nauseam* in the Imperial Parliament. Not only this, but by the power given, according to Mr. Gladstone's speech, to vote upon motions of want of confidence in the Government and upon any motion "*incidental*" to any Bill or motion exclusively affecting Great Britain, the Irish members will be able practically to raise a second debate upon almost any measure before the Imperial Parliament. The waste of public time will, therefore, be not lessened but doubled under the new arrangement. The eighty Irish members will determine the fate of Ministries. They will, therefore, practically decide the policy of the Government—what Bills it shall introduce and who is to introduce them. So far from getting rid of Irish obstruction by Mr. Gladstone's scheme, that

obstruction will be hung round the neck of the Imperial Parliament for all future time with tenfold greater intensity, The Irish control under the new Bill will be like the grip of the Old Man of the Sea round the neck of Sinbad the sailor; and it will probably have a similar termination.

THE VETO.

The exercise of the veto of the Irish Viceroy, under the direction of the Crown, that is on the advice of the British Cabinet, will cause infinite disputes, deadlocks, and troubles between the two Ministries and the two Parliaments. As Mr. Balfour said in his powerful speech of February 14th,

"Let me suppose some case arising in Ireland upon which English Ministers of the Crown take a very strong opinion exactly opposite to the opinion taken by the Irish Ministers. The Irish Ministers give the Viceroy the advice not to withhold the veto; the English Ministers advise Her Majesty to withdraw her Viceroy unless he will promise to veto the Bill. Both sets of Ministers announce that they will resign unless their advice is followed. It appears to me it would then rest with the Crown to decide whether she will lose her Irish Administration, or her English Administration. Let us suppose that she decides to lose her Irish Administration. Then the veto is given, not in accordance with the advice of Irish Ministers, but in accordance with the advice of English Ministers. You have deadlock in Ireland and things go smoothly in England; but if, on the other hand, the Crown takes the opposite course, then things will go smoothly in Ireland, but not in England. In the first place, it is evident you will very much augment the power of the Crown, and in the second place, that you will bring into existence a state of things which might at any moment produce deadlock either in your Irish Government or in your English Government."

The helpless and painful position in which the Viceroy will find himself, if he attempts to exercise his power of veto, is admirably pointed out by the author of "Home Rule Bubble," in *Blackwood*, in March, 1893:—

"Next to the so-called domestic safeguards, we come to the external checks which it is proposed to apply to the Irish Administration and Legislature. Chief among these is the veto of the Viceroy, now to be appointed for six years, and freed from religious disabilities. With the Viceroy is to be associated an Executive chosen from the Irish Privy Council; and with the assistance of this Council he is to determine what measures are to be initiated in the Legislature and what Acts vetoed. We may presume that this Council is to be made up of the Irish ministers, for the existence of a Legislature implies ministers responsible to it. But this is a Cabinet and not a Council, as we understand matters on this side of St. George's Channel. And if the Viceregal office, as representing the Crown, is to be maintained in proper dignity and respect, surely the first care that should be exercised is to fence it against being degraded by association with unfitting councillors. *It is more than probable that Her Majesty's representative may find himself seated between an ex-dynamitard on one hand and a ticket-of-leave man on the other*; and his first set of colleagues will to a certainty be composed of former denizens of Kilmainham. There never was such a flagrant attempt to drag the representation of the British Crown into the dirt at the very outset of Irish autonomy. The vetoing powers of the Viceroy are as unworkable as his position is unseemly. Amid the utter confusion introduced by the Bill it is difficult to

enumerate the many cases in which *the Viceroy*—standing between the Irish Legislature, his own Council, the British Parliament, and the British Cabinet, each of which, under the circumstances thus brought about, may entertain a policy differing from that of any or all the others—*will find himself powerless to do anything* except to throw up his appointment in disgust. If he dares to employ the veto, whether on his own judgment, the advice of his councillors, or on the express commands of the British Home Secretary, a shriek will be raised by the supporters of the vetoed Act all over the country that the concession of autonomy to Ireland is a sham; and the cry in this instance will not be very wide of the mark. The clamour will be caught up by the Irishmen in the British House, and every veto of the Viceroy will be made the pretext for demanding a more free and unfettered constitution."

Mr. Sexton could not conceal his glee over the mighty leverage which the retention of the 80 Irish Members in the Imperial Parliament would give the Irish Nationalist party. He said on February 13th:—

"If it should be found that the Imperial Parliament officiously and vexatiously interferes in the sphere it has defined for the Parliament of Ireland, or that the British Ministers are reasonably suspected of attempting to use the veto of the Crown against the rights of the Irish Legislature, then I think it will be found that *the unique position which Ireland occupies, having a Legislature in Ireland and also representatives in this House, would stand us in good stead.*"

Under the title of "The Only Veto on the Veto," Mr. Frank Hugh O'Donnell, a well-known Irish Nationalist and formerly M.P., contributes an instructive letter to *United Ireland*, February 4th, 1893:—

"Few Irishmen have ever realised what the interference of Ireland on the more vital questions of Imperial policy could effect in furtherance of our domestic interests. . . . Let the coming Home Rule Bill place even an inadequate Home Administration in College Green, and let Ireland not only possess but use her full power of interference, direction, and retaliation on Imperial policy in the Imperial Parliament, and I defy all the would-be vetoists between the Land's End and John o' Groat's House to intrude even a finger-tip into our concerns without instantly and adequately receiving a corresponding castigation, as one might say, on the Imperial seat of honour. . . . No veto will be ever worth six months' purchase so long as you keep forty or fifty couples of wolf-dogs able and ready to fly at the Imperial throat at the first hostile demonstration towards our country."

"NO ENGLISH VETO."

Sir John Lubbock put this point well, in his speech in the House of Commons, on February 14th, 1893:—

"The right hon. gentleman had told the House that it was a cardinal feature of his proposals to maintain the supremacy of Parliament. But how was that to be insured? Not through the police, for they would gradually pass to the local authorities. Not through the Executive Government, for they would be under the Irish Parliament. Through the troops? They would be most unsatisfactory. But who was to call them out? Sir J. Stephen pointed out this difficulty in a letter to *The Times* on May 1st, 1886, when he said:—'How would the troops be set in motion? No military officer would act on his own responsibility. The Irish magistrates, answerable to the Irish Legislative Body, would not call upon the

troops to act against the orders of that body, though they might be compelled to act in obedience to it.'

"Under this Bill the supremacy of the Imperial Parliament in Ireland would be a mockery and a sham."

There is not the slightest chance that either section of the Irish Nationalists will be *permanently* satisfied with the control of the Imperial Parliament. Mr. Gladstone and Sir William Harcourt have talked vaguely in favour of "Imperial control," but they have utterly failed to show how it can be achieved or maintained. On the memorable night of February 15th, early in the session of 1892, when Mr. John Redmond, as Leader of the Parnellite section, challenged Sir William Harcourt to give assurances on this subject, Sir William Harcourt evaded a reply by leaving the House, and running away. Such conduct was unprecedented on the part of the leader of a great party—for Sir William Harcourt was then leading the Opposition.

Mr. John Redmond, speaking in the House of Commons on that occasion (February 15th, 1892), said:—

"What the Nationalists ask is that in the Home Rule scheme of Mr. Gladstone there should be a clause or a satisfactory undertaking that while the Irish Parliament continued in existence *the powers of the Imperial Parliament to legislate for Ireland would never be used;* so that the Imperial Parliament would retain its power in strict constitutional theory to take away the Irish Legislature, but *the Irish members would require a formal compact that while the Irish Legislature lasted it would be a free and unfettered Parliament for Irish affairs.* It is no answer to say that the Irish Parliament will pass laws hostile to England, for that is a case which would be dealt with by a tribunal which would have to be constituted in Ireland. What the Irish Members object to is not the retention of the supremacy of the Imperial Parliament in the sense that Parliament can take away the Irish Legislature, but that there should be a right of revision, amendment, review and repeal of specific Acts of the Irish Parliament acting within its proper limits. The right hon. member for Midlothian, in dealing with the Bill of 1886, in May of that year, said that the Parliament he wanted to give to Ireland was one perfectly independent in the discharge of its statutory functions, and in June he said that the Parliament would have the real and practical independent management of its own affairs. As to the question of *the exercise of the veto*, Mr. Parnell had demanded that the veto of the Crown should be exercised as it was exercised in Imperial affairs—that was to say, in accordance with the advice of the Ministers of the Crown—and *what Irish members meant was that it was to be exercised in accordance with the advice of the Irish Ministers.*"

"There is not an Irish representative or politician who will accept one jot less as a final or satisfactory settlement of the Home Rule question than what is contained in that programme of Mr. Parnell."

What then was it that Mr. Parnell demanded? Speaking at the great Leinster Hall Meeting, on July 23rd, 1891, he said:—

"It is now known to all men that when our Parliament has been restored to us it shall have power to make laws for Ireland, and *there shall be no English veto upon those laws except the constitutional veto of the Crown*, exercised in the same way *as in the Imperial Parliament.*"—*Leinster Hall*, July 23rd, 1891.

It is noticeable that Mr. John Redmond still adheres to his principle of *no English veto*. Speaking in the House of Commons on February 15th, 1893, Mr. Redmond said:—

"Last October I stated what I understood to be the necessity of the case. In reference to the Veto I said—'We have to make it clear and unmistakable that in the daily life of our new Parliament *the veto of the Crown will be exercised constitutionally on the advice of the Irish Ministers*, and that it will not be made a practice for the interference by the Imperial Government or the English Cabinet in the government of those purely Irish affairs which are committed to the charge of the new Irish Legislature.' I always took the view of the clause of the Bill of 1886 as plain on this question. . . . . There is no doubt on the point in my mind. You must not expect that any safeguard will be successful for the Government of Ireland which sets up either directly or indirectly this Imperial Parliament as a Court of Appeal on the acts of the Irish Legislature. Such a position would be an intolerable one for this House, and would be still more intolerable for the Irish Legislature. I say our position would be much worse than it is at present if, after having constituted a local Legislature in Ireland, this House should act as a sort of a Court of Appeal to revise, amend, or repeal any of the Acts of the Irish Parliament."

United Ireland of February 18th, 1893, said:—

"This proposal of an English veto on certain specified Bills must be resisted. What we claim is absolute practical supremacy in the affairs delegated to our Parliament. This was Parnell's idea, and Isaac Butt's before him. . . . . We do not, as Mr. Redmond said, deny the supremacy of the Imperial Parliament, but if Irish Nationalists are to abandon their long-held doctrine of the invalidity of the Act of Union—as they must if they accept this Bill—they will insist on a *quid pro quo*. It is said that no Parliament can bind a subsequent one, but while this is so in theory, we are willing to take our chance on a clause in the Constitution which will specifically promise for the Imperial power that it shall not interfere with us while we keep within the Constitution's recognised limits. . . . . But there would be no chance of Home Rule succeeding under such a condition of affairs. Not alone, under the veto arrangement, would a Tory Cabinet have the right to veto any Irish Bill which might tell against their party in Ireland, but actually under a Liberal Government every Unionist member, no matter whether he came from Scotland, Ireland, Wales, or England, would have the power to initiate a debate on any Act—or perhaps on any Bill—of the Irish Assembly. How absurd and mischievous the former power especially would be will at once be seen when we reflect that, say five years hence, after we had received control of the Land Question, the Prime Minister in a Parliament which had confessed itself incapable of dealing with the matter, would have the power of rendering null and void any settlement adopted by the body to which the Question had been transferred. We acknowledge the difficulties surrounding both these points, and we acknowledge that perhaps Mr. Gladstone has done what he could, but we feel bound to say that the *arrangements as to the supremacy of the Imperial Parliament and of the veto, so far as we can discover them in the speeches we have quoted, are both unworkable and unsatisfactory.*"

THE ANTI-PARNELLITES ON THE IMPERIAL VETO.

The *Freeman's Journal* in December, 1891, says:—

"A deliberate attempt is being made to represent that the National party would be willing to accept an abortion of Home Rule. We therefore state once again, for the benefit of Mr. Redmond and those friends of his throughout the country who imagine that the late Mr. Parnell and his followers are the sole repositories of

national independence, that the definition of national self-government laid down by Mr. Parnell himself on July 23rd, 1891, and which referred to the essential provisions of the next Home Rule Bill, is entirely satisfactory to us as a fair definition, so far as it goes, of the only Home Rule which it would be either safe or honourable for our people to accept."

And Mr. William O'Brien, on January 25th, 1892, emphatically demanded that the Irish Parliament should be as "free as air."

Mr. Redmond's speech, quoted above, was made in the presence of all the Irish Nationalist Members. The Anti-Parnellite leaders, Messrs. Sexton, Dillon, William O'Brien, and Justin McCarthy, were present. Not one of them repudiated Mr. Redmond's statement about "the veto of the Crown" alone. Indeed, all the Anti-Parnellite Members have repeatedly said that they would be satisfied with no less power for the Irish Parliament than was demanded by Mr. Parnell.

Will the Irish leaders now specifically withdraw these demands? Will they assent to the veto being exercised over the legislation of the Irish Parliament by the Crown on the advice of the British or Imperial Cabinet, and not on the advice of the Irish Cabinet?

GLADSTONIAN LEADERS ON IMPERIAL CONTROL.

That is the real question. Meanwhile it is interesting to note what the Gladstonian leaders have said in the past upon this subject of Imperial control.

During this last election of July, 1892, Mr. Oscar Browning was a candidate for East Worcestershire. Mr. Browning said that any Bill passed by the Irish Parliament would be *subject to the veto of the Queen by the advice of her English Ministers.* The accuracy of that statement, as expressing the view of the Gladstonian party, was questioned in the Press, and thereupon a letter was written by Mr. Gladstone, dated May 26th, to Mr. Thomas Harris, of Birmingham, in which he said: "*Mr. Browning's account of the veto, if I understand it correctly, is right, and the opposite contention is absurd.*" The opposite contention was that the veto would be exercised on the advice of the Irish Ministers.

Sir William Harcourt at Cirencester, on April 17th, 1891, said:—

"The principle for which the Liberal party have contended has been the right of the Irish people to manage their own affairs, subject—always subject—to the control of the Imperial Parliament. That is the principle we have always proclaimed and depended upon, and that is the principle upon which we shall always stand."

Mr. Fowler, now president of the Local Government Board, made at Rawtenstall the following statement on 20th January, 1892:

"The Irish Parliament might do foolish things. They must work their own salvation. But if they did wrong things, the supremacy of the Imperial Parliament becomes an effective force."

Mr. Asquith, the Gladstonian Home Secretary, in a letter to his constituents (quoted by Mr. Chamberlain, on February 2nd, 1893, in the House of Commons), demanded:—

"A Parliament which *should maintain intact and unimpaired the unquestioned and unquestionable supremacy of the Imperial Parliament over all persons and in all matters local and Imperial.*"

Sir George Trevelyan (quoted by Mr. Chamberlain at the same time) said:—

"The confession that the Liberal party was a Home Rule party—I speak with all respect to those who think otherwise—is one which until every faculty I have is strained to the uttermost, and every constitutional method inside and outside the House has been exhausted, I for one will never consent to."

Sir Charles Russell said at Swindon, August 17th, 1892:—

"I repeat what I have already said as to the safeguards and checks to prevent any possible injury or injustice under a scheme of Home Rule. There are three effective checks. There is the veto of the Crown, there was the inherent right of the Imperial Parliament *to repeal or to modify any enactment it might make*, and there is also the inherent right of Parliament—of which it could not divest itself even if it desired to do so—to legislate if occasion warranted it, directly in relation to Ireland itself."

But what is the meaning of this vague talk of the Gladstonian leaders as to Imperial control? This "veto of the Crown" is the purest Constitutional fiction. It is never exercised in this country; there has been no instance of the Crown vetoing an Act or Resolution of Parliament for centuries. The proposals of the Nationalists therefore amount to practical separation. Is there any scheme which any English Statesman dare propose, that the Nationalists leaders dare and can accept, as final in the name of the Irish people? To that query we have already Mr. Parnell's answer which has been emphasised in various forms by all the Nationalist leaders, Parnellite and anti-Parnellite alike:—

"'If our claims are conceded,' he declared, on October 10th, 1885, 'I have no mandate from the Irish people to dictate a course of action to those who may succeed us.'"

The most obvious causes of disagreement would be the restrictions as to trade and navigation, the annual tribute to be paid out of the Irish Customs, and questions relating to the military and volunteer forces of Ireland. The main difficulties between England and Ireland in past centuries have arisen out of questions of trade and navigation. There is no likelihood that in the future the divergency of feeling will be less. Mr. Parnell and his friends have already claimed the right to tax British products in order to protect Irish manufactures. And, as has been pointed out, what would the Irish say if the British Government were, for any reason, to limit the import of cattle

and pigs into this country from Ireland? Such a step would half ruin the Irish farmers.

Sir James Stephen, in his criticism on the 1886 Bill, which is very applicable to the new Bill, said:—

"That it would be fatal to the supremacy of the Imperial Parliament. Can the Imperial Parliament legislate for Ireland after the Act becomes law? Has it power to veto or repeal Acts of the Legislative Body? On general principles it would have such power, and the Government Bill contains no language which directly takes its way, but the Bill contains language which makes the intention doubtful. It reserves to Parliament exclusive authority 'as to all matters in relation to which it is not competent for the Irish Legislative Body to make or repeal laws' (section 37), and this may be construed as implying that in other matters the Imperial Parliament is not to have a concurrent jurisdiction.

"Again, can the Irish Legislative Body repeal Acts of the Imperial Parliament passed subsequently to the passing of the Government of Ireland Act? On general principles it would seem not, but the power to repeal, as given in the words already quoted, is absolute, and is not confined to Acts in force on the appointed day. Can this silence and ambiguity on points of the very highest constitutional importance, points morally certain to lead to passionate controversy, be due to any other cause than a reluctance to speak plainly and to say either yes or no on a vital question?

"Whatever Mr. Morley may say, I fear it is undeniably true, that, all guarantees and all argument notwithstanding, this Bill will, if it passes, reduce the supremacy of the Imperial Parliament to a mere idle name, and irrevocably confer upon persons who have persistently expressed for years together the most bitter hatred for England, powers which they will be able to use successfully, if they are so minded, for the purpose of erecting Ireland into a hostile and independent nation, having previously, in all probability, plundered, expelled, and oppressed that part of the Irish population which trusted in the honour of England and to a great extent represented its power and its ideas."

80 IRISH MEMBERS IN THE IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT.

The most astonishing and impracticable feature of the present Bill is the retention of the Irish members in the Imperial Parliament, and the attempt to discriminate between Irish, British, and Imperial affairs. Mr. Gladstone, when introducing his first Home Rule Bill on April 8th, 1886, spoke as follows concerning the possibility of retaining the Irish members at Westminster for Imperial affairs:—

"Is it practicable for Irish representatives to come here for the settlement, not of English and Scotch, but of Imperial affairs? In principle it would be very difficult, I think, to object to that proposition. But then its acceptance depends entirely upon our arriving at the conclusion that in this House we can draw for practical purposes a distinction between affairs which are Imperial and affairs which are not Imperial. It would not be difficult to say in principle that as the Irish Legislature will have nothing to do with Imperial concerns let Irish members come here and vote on Imperial concerns. All depends on the practicability of the distinction. Well, Sir, I have thought much, reasoned much, and inquired much with regard to that distinction. I had hoped it might be possible to draw a

distinction, and I have arrived at the conclusion that it cannot be drawn. *I believe it passes the wit of man; at any rate, it passes not my wit alone, but the wit of many with whom I have communicated.* This House is not merely a Legislative House; it is a House controlling the Executive; and *when you come to the control of the Executive, then your distinction between Imperial subjects and non-Imperial subjects totally breaks down*—they are totally insufficient to cover the whole case."

From his speech on February 13th, 1893, it is clear that Mr. Gladstone is of the same opinion still. There is no doubt that the presence of the eighty Irish members at Westminster will afford infinite opportunities for what Mr. Gladstone called "Intrigue" in the matter of financial arrangements between the two countries. The Irish eighty will hold the balance between the two parties in the Imperial Parliament. Whenever the Irish Exchequer is empty, which, judging from all past Irish experience, will be frequent, the Irish eighty will make the granting of some pecuniary advantage—a grant-in-aid, or a loan on very easy terms, or a diminution of the Irish contribution towards the Imperial expenses—a condition of their support; and they will almost certainly have their way.

Sir William Harcourt, speaking at Blandford in September, 1885, before he had turned Separatist, made a most accurate prediction as to the part which the Irish contingent in the Imperial Parliament will play.

"I will give you one more specimen. Mr. William O'Brien, the editor of *United Ireland*, made a speech in which he said this:—'*Mr. Parnell's eighty members of Parliament would fasten in the flank in the English Parliament, and rankle in them like a spear head.* If the English people did not want peace, Mr. Parnell would give them war—such war as eighty Irish guerillas could carry on with the weapon of the franchise, with the weapon of the boycotting pike, as it was called, and with any other weapon that time and opportunity might offer them.' That is what we have to meet, and if the English Parliament is not to become a helpless tool in the hands of this party you must give an overwhelming majority to the only party which has the courage and the honesty to face them."

IRISH VOTE.

The effect of the Irish vote in English towns in future has received very little consideration. Hitherto, it has been mainly directed to supporting Home Rule policy. In future, however, if there are 80 Irish members in the Imperial Parliament, there is little doubt it will be used to affect Scotch and English questions. Whenever the Irish vote on an Imperial question reverses the vote of a majority on a British question, the Irish vote in the constituencies will, at the elections, be undoubtedly thrown against the British majority in favour of the side taken by the 80 Irish members.

TWO MAJORITIES.

It is one of the most monstrous features of the Bill, that, not only does it create two Parliaments in the United Kingdom, and two Governments in the United Kingdom, but it also creates two distinct majorities in the Imperial Parliament. There will be first the British majority. This, when the Irish members are absent, will probably be Conservative. There will be a second majority when the Irish members are present. This, unless the Conservative majority exceeds 60 without them (as out of the Irish 80, about 60 would be Nationalists), would be a Gladstonian or Radical majority. There may, therefore, easily be a Conservative majority one day and a Radical majority next—a state of things which would present the formation of any stable Government, and which would be perfectly intolerable.

In the case of a great war, taxing the resources of the Empire to the uttermost, Ireland is not liable under the Bill to contribute anything beyond this £2,370,000 fixed by the Bill. The Irish Parliament and the 80 Irish members in the Imperial Parliament might be opposed to the war. Supposing for example that United Italy was fighting on the side which the Imperial Parliament espoused, and the Papacy was in favour of the enemies of Great Britain. These enemies, *e.g.*, France and Russia, might have undertaken, in the event of victory, to restore the Pope's temporal power. There is no doubt that the great majority of the Irish Parliament, under clerical dictation as it would be, would favour the Papal side. Mr. Chamberlain put the case well in his speech on February 17th:—

"The eighty Irish members would come to the Imperial Parliament against the war, and they would make themselves heard probably at some length (laughter); they would embarrass and hamper the conduct of the war by the British Government, but they would be outvoted. When they were outvoted you would have to make heavy demands in order to defray the cost of such a war. You would have, under this Bill, full control of the Customs but you could not rely upon the Customs. You would have to rely upon the Excise, upon the Income Tax, and upon internal taxes. Suppose you have got your taxation from the Imperial Parliament, all the collection of the taxes is in the hands of the Irish Parliament. (Cheers.) What if they resist? I am not speaking at this moment of active resistance, but suppose that the sentiment of the country is against you, all the organisation of the country, the Executive of the country, the police of the country, the judiciary of the country, the civil officials of Ireland—all are under the control of the native and popular assembly, all are moved by the same sentiment—it seems to me you would increase the risk of almost insurmountable obstacles."

The case in which a Ministry, beaten without the Irish vote in the Imperial Parliament, resigns and appeals to the country, was well put in the *St. James's Gazette* of February 16th, 1893:—

"Suppose they do resign and dissolve; suppose they go to the country and come back with their strength approximately the same as before: what then? For

the leaders of which party is the Queen to send—for the defeated leaders who rely on the 'Imperial majority,' or for the leaders of the party which has defeated them at the polls? Suppose she chose the latter—the representatives of the English majority. Her Majesty's Ministers would be in this agreeable and dignified position. They could initiate as many Bills as they pleased; but any day a Vote of Censure might be moved, and they would have to go. Suppose the Queen 'sent for' the leaders of the other party—the Anglo-Irish majority. They could never carry an English Bill through Committee; yet they could not be got out, for they could obtain (the Irish having popped in) a Vote of Confidence from the House whenever they chose to challenge it."

Mr. Gladstone has in the present scheme attempted to distinguish between British and Imperial affairs, though he admitted, and seemed to glory in the admission, that in his opinion no such distinction is possible in practice. In his opening speech, on February 13th, he described the attempt to distinguish between Imperial and British affairs, so as to allow the eighty Irish members at Westminster to vote upon the former and not upon the latter, as an extremely "indigestible process," as an "anomaly," and as "full of thorns and brambles." He admitted that there is no "accurate line of cleavage" between Imperial, British and Irish questions. The "Irish Eighty" are nominally to be refused the right to vote "on any Bill or resolution which is expressly confined to Great Britain, or on any tax not levied in Ireland," or on "any motion or resolution exclusively affecting Great Britain, or any person or persons therein." But they are, according to Mr. Gladstone's speech of February 13th, to be allowed to vote on any motion "*incidental* to such Bill or motion," and they are also to vote on any vote of want of confidence in the Ministry of the day. Can anything be so ridiculous as such proposals?

Mr. Gladstone himself condemned such a system in his speech of April 8th, 1886, in the strongest way. He then said:—

"*What an anomaly it would be*, what a mutilation of all our elementary ideas about the absolute equality of members in this House, *were we to have ordinarily among us two classes of members, one of them qualified to vote on all kinds of business, and another qualified only to vote here and there on particular kinds of business*, and obliged to submit to some criterion or other—say the authority of the Chair—novel for such a purpose and difficult to exercise—in order to determine what kinds of business they could vote upon, and what kinds of business they must abstain from voting on!"

And Sir James Stephen said upon this:—

"But human ingenuity cannot supply any test by which Imperial and local business can be distinguished. The truth is that the United Kingdom is so emphatically and essentially one that there is no possibility of introducing a second Parliament into it without destroying all that is most characteristic and best worth having in the first. The scheme by which it is proposed to do so introduces a bastard federalism, which, if the Irish members stay where they are, will give them the command of the whole kingdom, and which, if they are excluded, will rapidly and irrevocably convert Ireland into a hostile foreign country."

Yet this scheme, which Mr. Gladstone has himself declared unworkable, is the very one which he now proposes in his new Home Rule Bill.

"TO VOTE OR NOT TO VOTE."

Let us take two or three concrete cases, for this is the best way to illustrate what will happen. The Conservative party, we will assume for the sake of argument, has a majority of fifty in the new Imperial Parliament, and Mr. Arthur Balfour is Prime Minister. A Radical member proposes the disestablishment of the English Church, and that measure is defeated by the Conservative majority of fifty, the Irish eighty not being allowed to vote as it is purely an English question. The next day Sir William Harcourt, who we will assume to be leading the Opposition, comes down to the House and moves a vote of want of confidence in the Conservative Government. The Irish eighty will now come in and vote, as under Mr. Gladstone's Bill they would have the right to do. The Imperial Government, which really has a majority of fifty in Great Britain, finds itself in a minority in the joint House, and is obliged to resign.

Sir William Harcourt then forms a Government, and brings in a measure, we will suppose, for the abolishing of plural voting in England. This being a purely British subject, the Irish eighty are not allowed to vote upon it, and the Bill might be defeated by a majority of fifty. Sir William Harcourt thereupon resigns, and Mr. Balfour comes in again. There is nothing to prevent this process from going on *ad infinitum*. Or let us take another absurd case. Supposing the Conservative Government, having a majority of fifty, bring in a Bill to increase the Volunteer forces in England and Scotland, and that Bill is carried by the British majority. Next day Sir William Harcourt, or it might be, an Irish leader, say Mr. Sexton, comes down and proposes a similar establishment of armed volunteers for Ireland. The Imperial Government opposes such an extension of the volunteer force as dangerous to the public safety, but the Government is defeated by the votes of the eighty Irish members, and resigns. What then is to happen?

The *Echo* said on Feb. 15th:—

"Retention at once cuts away the most popular argument for Home Rule. English constituencies have been repeatedly told that English legislation is in arrear because Ireland blocks the way, and if Irish business were relegated to an Irish Parliament, there would be plenty of time for the House of Commons to do it's work. Let us take one illustration. What could be a more purely English question than Mr. James Lowther's proposal to stop pauper alien immigration? Yet that involves our relations with other countries, and sets an example of exclusion to the United States and Canada which Irishmen would be the first to feel.

The establishment of two sets of Members in the House of Commons at once suggests the question whether the fate of a Ministry would be decided by the British Members only, or by the British Members plus the Irish Members. There can be but one answer. Inasmuch as the Government has to deal with Imperial questions, it must stand or fall by the vote of the whole House. How would this work? Let us suppose that Cardinal Vaughan and Archbishop Benson unite in demanding that in England clerical schools shall be supported by the rates. A Radical Government resists. At once some question within the Imperial category is raised, and a big contingent of Irish Members is brought over to oust the Government, and virtually to determine how English money is to be spent. Mr. Gladstone's distinction between English and Imperial questions, at the first moment that party passion rises high, will disappear like a child's castle of sand before the rising wave. The Englishman would never be master in his own house. This is a fatal objection to the proposal."

Or, again, let us take the case of motions for the adjournment of the House. This is a point bristling with difficulties. A Conservative Government being in office in Great Britain, a Radical member proposes the payment of members in Great Britain. His proposal is defeated by the normal Conservative majority. Next day the Radical member gets up and proposes to move the adjournment of the House in order to consider an urgent question of public importance connected with the payment of all members in the Imperial Parliament. Irish as well as British. Are the eighty Irish members to be allowed to vote or not to vote on such a proposal? It is quite certain that they will never consent to be deprived of the privilege of voting on motions for the adjournment of the House But if this privilege be given them, the stability of any English Government will not be worth a day's purchase.

Sir Edward Clarke put the difficulty well in his powerful speech in the House of Commons, on Feb. 13th:—

"Take question time. If with regard to some important matter of foreign affairs a question is asked on this side and answered from the other, the answer may produce such an effect upon the House that within an hour a motion is made for the adjournment of the debate, the object and the meaning of that motion, if it be carried, being that the House desires to censure the Minister on the spot for the line which he has taken. (Hear, hear.) What about the Irish members? Are we in such a position to wait until they can be summoned from Dublin in order that they may come over here to take part in the vote of censure? (Laughter and "Hear, hear.") The proposition is, I venture to say, impossible."

Mr. Gladstone quite rightly gave an expression of warning as to the effect upon Imperial politics of leaving the door open at any moment to the intervention of what he called "these eighty Irish gentlemen." These are Mr. Gladstone's words:—

"If some very large question of controversy, entirely British, but still deep and vital, were severing the two great parties in this House, and the members of those parties knew that whichever could buy over the eighty Irish representatives, or a large contingent of them, to support their views would carry the day, I am afraid, Sir, of opening a possible door to wholesale and dangerous political intrigue."

A GRAVE CONSTITUTIONAL CHANGE.

The serious results that will follow from the establishment of two classes of members in the Imperial Parliament, and of two distinct majorities are well described in the following extract from *Blackwood's Magazine*:—

"But whether the Irish members are to be permanently retained or whether they are to present themselves in Parliament only when summoned, the subject of two unequal orders in the House of Commons remains equally serious. A grave constitutional question arises which to the British electorate is even more important than any scheme for permitting the Irish Home Rulers to misgovern their own country. The constitution of the House of Commons is the product of a long and slow growth; it bears the mark of the wisdom and experience of centuries; it is so compactly welded together that one portion cannot be removed without threatening the stability of the whole. Perfect equality in the Parliamentary status of all its members, freedom of speech, and freedom of voting have always belonged to the House of Commons. We have now proposed the erection of two orders of members in the House, with different powers and privileges; a limitation of freedom of speech on the part of one order or the other to certain specified subjects, and an absolute denial of the right of voting to the inferior order upon subjects also specified. Such a radical change in the constitution of the Commons appears to us to be much too grave a matter to be effected by the subordinate clauses of an Irish bill. The propriety of such an innovation can only be pronounced upon by the constituencies, and Mr. Gladstone has never condescended to ask their opinion upon the matter. The right honourable gentleman has in fact begun at the wrong end of his task. Instead of seeking to fit his Home Rule scheme into the constitution of the House of Commons, he should have begun by fitting the House for the reception of his scheme. How valuable that constitution is to the security of the nation is implied in the resistance which it offers to Mr. Gladstone's present project, and his confession that it passes the wit of man to co-ordinate it with his ill-advised efforts. Before the constitution of the House is thus tampered with, it is necessary that the electorate should be consulted, and give a verdict upon a subject which has never been put before them, to the importance of which they awakened with surprise, and which may in the issue be of infinitely more consequence to the British democracy than any system of Home Rule that Mr. Gladstone ever has invented or ever will devise. But it is not merely the constitution of the House of Commons that Mr. Gladstone's bill aims at altering. The composition of the House of Lords is to be subjected to the same confusing re-arrangement. The representative Irish Peers are to be members of the Upper House as before, but to be fettered by the same restrictions as to deliberation and voting as the Irish Members in the Commons. Here, again, the principle of internal freedom and equality so essential to the due discharge of legislative functions is overthrown. The Peers of England and Scotland have a right to demand why the Peers of a country parliamentarily separated from their own should have a seat in their assembly, or any share at all in their deliberations. The Irish Peers, on the other hand, have a right to protest against being placed in an inferior position to the Peers of England and Scotland, against the injury done to their order in violation of the articles of Union, and against the infringement of the indefeasible right which every Peer of the realm has to give his opinion and counsel to the Sovereign upon all matters relating to the welfare of the State. To make the bill at all operative upon the Irish members of the House of Lords, the bill would have to prescribe a new and limited writ of summons to be issued to them, which would involve interference with the Royal prerogative, as well as with the constitution of the Upper House. For all these weighty constitutional reasons, the Lords, should the bill ever reach them, will be justified in rejecting it, apart altogether from the question of Home Rule or no Home Rule. The corruption of both Houses of Parliament by the destruction of equality and the institution of an inferior order of members is clearly a matter upon which the sense of the country will have to be taken."—"The Home Rule Bubble," in *Blackwood*, March, 1893.

THE ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY.

What will be the fate of the Royal Irish Constabulary under a Government controlled by men who have been in constant conflict and collision with them? The Leaders of the Irish Nationalist party have denounced the constabulary in the strongest terms, have spoken of them as "Balfour's hell-hounds." The Irish Constabulary are a splendid and loyal force. They have fearlessly and faithfully carried out the orders of the British Government, whether that Government was under Mr. Gladstone or Lord Salisbury. They have given up other professions and put themselves under a strict discipline, on the faith of the engagement by which they entered the service of the British Government. By the terms of that engagement they are entitled, if they do their duty, to due promotion in their profession, and to a pension when they become unfit for service.

Under the provisions of this Bill, the Royal Irish Constabulary and the Dublin Metropolitan Police are to be gradually reduced, and within a period of six years, abolished, although their claim to pension is affirmed in the Bill. Can any one who knows the character of the men that would control a separate Irish Parliament, and the constant and brutal threats they have used towards the Royal Irish Constabulary, doubt that gross injustice would be done to its members in the process of disbanding and pensioning these loyal forces? Especially would those suffer who have become obnoxious to the Land and the National Leagues in the discharge of their duty. Mr. Dillon said, at Castlereagh, December 5th, 1886:—

"The time is at hand when the police will be our servants, when the Irish police will be taking their pay from Mr. Parnell, when he will be Prime Minister of Ireland. . . . We will remember them. . . . We are not the men to forget who stood up against the people."

Mr. Gladstone dwelt with much unction upon the great cost of the Irish constabulary, which he placed at £1,500,000. But, again, he forgot to state that at least £500,000 of this sum was due to his own misgovernment during the past six years. *After Mr. Gladstone took office in April*, 1880, *the charge for the Irish constabulary increased by over half a million a year, and the total charge for the government of Ireland increased by nearly a million.*

The injustice threatened to the splendid loyal force, the Royal Irish Constabulary, is well illustrated by a letter from an officer in that body, which appeared in the *Times* of Feb. 27th, 1893:—

"I need not describe the impatience with which we waited for the publication of the Bill, and with what anxious care we mastered its paragraphs in the hope of finding the fulfilment of these promises.

"*It deprives us of our profession, which, in the case of the officers, was only won by great expense and trouble.* The officers had to pass a stiff competitive examination, as difficult, certainly, as that for commissions in the Army, which cost long preparation and special study. On joining the force, they had the certainty of a gradually increasing income, the hope of obtaining promotion to distinguished appointments connected with the service, and eventually they looked forward to a secure pension to support them and their families in their declining years. For all these benefits they worked hard and well, as every one admits.

"But Mr. Morley assured the House of Commons that when the Bill was laid on the table it would be seen how the force were to be provided for. For some strange reason that is not a fact. *The clause relating to the pensions and gratuities of the Royal Irish Constabulary is blank!* The omission of this, to us, all-important clause is alarming, and particularly so on account of some of the reasons given for its concealment. One is that a member of the Government received a suggestion or expression of opinion from a person having considerable influence in the Irish party that '*abolition terms*' *are the utmost that could be given to us.*

"Abolition terms are that members of the force will be compulsorily retired, their office being abolished, and that they receive a pension calculated on their present rate of pay, and ten years will be added to their present time of service in calculating the pensions.

"For instance, a district inspector of ten years' service, who now has pay and salary upon which pension is calculated amounting to £250, will be retired on a pension of £83 per annum. While serving he draws allowances which bring his income up to £310 a year. Thus, under the Bill on abolition terms, he will lose £227 a year, and be turned about his business."

Very much the same applies to the Civil Servants in Ireland, who have been most faithful and loyal to the British Government through many trying years. Their lives would be made intolerable for them, by a system of ingenious persecution, in which the Irish Nationalist Leaders are past masters.

THE IRISH JUDGES.

The future Irish judges, too, are to be placed at the mercy of the new Irish Parliament. by an arrangement under which, though they are to be appointed by the Imperial Government for six years, they are to be removable on an address presented by both Houses of the Irish Legislature. As the Nationalist party will control both houses, the Irish Judges of the future will be at the mercy of the dominant faction. After six years all Irish Judges, except the two Exchequer Judges, are to be appointed by the Irish Executive; that is, only tools of the Nationalist majority will be made Irish Judges. What will be the position of the Irish Loyalist? What chances of justice will he have, whether he be landowner, farmer, tradesman, peasant, policeman or civil servant, when the judges, the officials, the new police, and the whole Irish Administration are under the absolute control of the Nationalist members.

THREE SETS OF CONSTITUENCIES.

Under this Bill, Ireland is to be mapped out into three different sets of Constituencies. There is to be one set of Constituencies to elect the 48 members of the Legislative Council. There is to be a second set to elect the 80 members whom Ireland is to send to the Imperial Parliament. There is to be a third set to elect the 103 members for the Irish Legislative Chamber. This is only one instance of the innumerable complications and perplexities which this "Home Rule Bill" will introduce.

IRISH LAND.

The control over Irish Land is to be given to the Irish Parliament within three years, when the authors of the "Plan of Campaign" will have full power to plunder and ruin every Irish landowner, and will doubtless do so. Meanwhile the administration of all the Land Acts and Land Courts is to be put in the hands of the Irish Parliament, that is, of the Healys, William O'Briens, and Dillons. It will be easy for these ingenious and unscrupulous persons so to work these existing Acts and their various powers as to make the life of an Irish landowner unbearable.

The fate of the Irish landowner, under Mr. Gladstone's scheme is plainly pointed out in the article in *Blackwood*, in March, 1893, entitled, "The Home Rule Bubble":—

"The Irish land question, upon which Mr. Gladstone's previous Home Rule Bill was professedly based, now occupies so small a portion of his attention that he omitted all reference to it in his exposition of the measure. He has, however, given us incidentally to understand that the subject is to be reserved to the Imperial Parliament for three years. If the Premier's indifference to the land question arises from his perception of the beneficial change which the Ashbourne Acts are producing upon the agrarian difficulty, we can understand his position. But it will take more than three years, or three times three years, for these Acts to put the Irish land difficulty upon a satisfactory basis, more especially as an Irish Legislature in Dublin will make political capital of futile promises about the land when they get it into their own hands, and hold out extravagant ideas, which will bring purchases by tenants to a standstill in the meantime. And during these three years the carrying out of evictions and the enforcement of all agrarian decisions of the law courts will be left to the Irish Executive, with what results we need hardly pause to inquire. The arrangement under the Bill may be briefly described as a provision for allowing the Nationalists three years to worry the Irish landlords as a prelude to devouring them altogether. But if the Irish are wise they will insist upon taking the land with them from Westminster; for three years' working of an Irish administration may raise doubts in the minds of even the most advanced Radicals, whether it would be well to implement Mr. Gladstone's bargain. But if the Irish are not fit to be immediately trusted with the land, are they immediately fitted to be intrusted with a Legislature? Mr. Gladstone does not propose a Land Bill at the present moment, but there can be no doubt that some measure is a part of the understanding between him and his clients. We may expect, then, that when the Irish take over the administration of the land they do not intend to do so

empty-handed, but that Great Britain will be called upon to provide for some such extravagant outlay as accompanied the Premier's former proposal."

And a writer in *St. James's Gazette* points out very clearly an easy method by which the property of the landowners can be rapidly confiscated:—

"Mr. Gladstone's Land Act was passed in 1881. The Sub-Commissioners under it fixed fair rents for fifteen years, at the end of which period they were to be revised. The three years thus bring us to the commencement of the period for the revision of fair rents all over Ireland. I need hardly say that the Irish tenant-farmers will return a large majority of the members of both the Irish Houses. *The Irish Administration will, I presume, have the power of appointing the new Sub-Commissioners, to whom the task of fixing fair rents will be entrusted.* At all events these Sub-Commissioners will not fall within the scope of the provisions which protect the Irish Judges (other than the judges of the Court of Bankruptcy) and a very small proportion of the judicial officers who are not entitled to the rank of judge. They will thus be entirely under the control of the Irish Administration, and the proviso which prevents the Irish Parliament from confiscating the property of the landlords will not prevent a reduction of 60 or 70 per cent. on the judicial rents by a packed or dependent Sub-Commission. True, there is a power of appeal; *but set 200 Sub-Commissioners to work in the way that I have indicated*, and how long will three Commissioners take to hear the appeals? And might not the Irish Parliament, without exceeding its powers, limit the right of appeal to cases where there was some legal principle involved, and not the mere value of the land?"

Mr. Austen Taylor effectively points out that the interest guaranteed under the Land Purchase Act of 1891, and the greater part of the pensions of the Irish constabulary will be entirely at the mercy of the new Irish Parliament. He writes in the *Times* of Feb. 27th, 1893:—

"Section 5 of Clause 30 and sub-sections (6) of section 1 and (*a*) of section 3 in clause 14. These provide for the payment by the Irish Exchequer of the dividends and sinking fund of the Guaranteed Land Stock (1891), and of two-thirds of the net pensions that may be assigned to the constabulary and police force by the Treasury. As the immediate repudiation of these charges (if the sections are not modified in Committee) will infallibly be the first move of any member in the Irish Legislative Assembly who wishes to become the most popular man in Ireland, it is well to look them in the face. From the Irish point of view, the first charge will be the tribute which was wrung from the Irish peasant in order to buy out a rapacious oppressor; the second will be the reward which the Irish peasant is privileged to pay to a force whose chief employment in the past was to brutally evict him."

TRADE BOUNTIES.

Although it is true that Mr. Gladstone's Bill denies the Irish Parliament the right to impose duties upon British products, there is nothing to prevent the Irish Parliament from granting "Bounties" on Irish products, and in such a way as to practically shut British products out of Irish markets. Sir William Harcourt admitted this in reply to my question in the House of Commons on March 16th, 1893. As the author of "Savings and Safeguards" wrote in the *Times* of March 2nd, 1893:—

"How will the system work in practice? In the first place, the Irish Government is not restrained from giving bounties to any favoured branches of native

industry or commerce. Mr. Parnell always regarded that method with sympathy, and, indeed, it has a flavour of jobbery about it which naturally commends it to the Irish mind. From every part of the country and from every sectional interest, from farmers and stock-breeders, from distillers and brewers, from woollen manufacturers, from linen manufacturers, and from paper makers, the cry will go up for 'encouragement,' and, as long as the money lasts that can be squeezed out of owners of property, whether in reality or personalty, no policy will be more popular with the Irish masses. The system is manifestly 'contrived a double debt to pay.' Bounty-fed industries may easily drive British goods out of Irish markets and force Irish goods, especially agricultural produce, into British markets. If Irish oats and Irish hay, Irish butter and Irish bacon were to get a bounty on exportation to England and Scotland, the unfortunate British farmer could be undersold and ousted from his own market, while the British manufacturers might be unable to compete with their bounty-receiving rivals in Ireland Moreover, these bounties may be so distributed as to leave the industries of Protestant Ulster at a grievous disadvantage and to draw away capital from them.

"Nor is this all. Though 'prohibitions in connection with the duties of Excise' are to be regulated by the Imperial Parliament, there is no limitation on prohibitions in general. There is nothing that we can see to prevent the Irish Government from forbidding absolutely the import or the export of any commodity whatever—an instrument of enormous power either for the creation of a forced market or for compassing the ruin of an obnoxious interest. Internal *octroi* duties can also be levied and licence duties not only can be, but must be, in the absence of other resources, imposed upon trades and industries."

RELIGIOUS ESTABLISHMENT.

Under the Bill, the Irish Parliament is prohibited from setting up a religious establishment in Ireland. There would, however, be little difficulty in evading this provision, and it would be practically impossible for the Imperial Parliament to effectually intervene in case the Irish Parliament chose to establish or endow the Roman Catholic Church. Mr. Chamberlain in his Speech, on February 18th, 1893, in the House of Commons, gave two instances in which it could be carried out by a side wind:—

"Now, what provision does the Bill make? In the first place, it seeks to protect the Protestants by declaring unlawful the establishment of a Church and also by some provision with respect to education. I do not want to draw the argument too fine, but I may be permitted to point out that, if there were a strong feeling in Ireland in favour of an established and endowed clergy, there is nothing in the Bill to prevent that being done. There are fifty ways in which your Bill could be legally evaded. I will give one, merely as an instance. Suppose that the Irish Parliament provided a considerable salary for the managers of schools. What is to prevent the district from electing the parish priest in every case as manager? (Hear, hear.) In that way, by a side wind, if the sentiment of the people were with you—it all depends on that—you could effect a great endowment of the Irish Roman Catholic Church, even in spite of the restrictive provisions of my right hon. friend."

"I have been told that in some places boards of guardians have made particular payments to sisters of mercy who had attended in connection with the work of the dispensaries. Now, it is perfectly evident to the House that, if it were desired to do so, it would be perfectly possible under a system of this kind practically to endow Roman Catholic convents. There is nothing to prevent boards of guardians from making, if they please, such grants to ladies occupied in this work as would

in effect provide for a very considerable endowment. (Hear. hear.) Well, that is in distinct contradiction of the restrictive clause in the Bill which pretends to prevent ecclesiastical establishments. All I want to ask the House is, how are you going to deal with it in this Bill? You cannot touch the boards of guardians, and, even if you were to make it illegal by law—which, I think, you would have some difficulty in doing—I do not see how you can get the law administered."

As the Nonconformist *British Weekly* wrote on February 16th, 1893:—

"The right to establish the Church is still withdrawn, but we do not think there is any reality in this restriction. For suppose that by-and-bye, as is quite certain, the Irish Legislative Assembly demanded the Establishment and Endowment of the Roman Catholic Church. Suppose, as is equally certain, that this resolution were passed by both Houses, and brought before the Imperial Parliament—who would oppose it? Would the Conservatives? We do not believe it. They would say, and say rightly, that every argument for the establishment of a Church in England, Scotland, and Wales may be used with far greater force for the Establishment of the Church of Rome in Ireland. The High Church clergy could not well refuse to support such a measure. They stand by the Presbyterian Establishment in Scotland, although they think that Presbyterians do not constitute a church. The Church of Rome, in their view, occupies a very much higher position, and their support of it would be proportionately enthusiastic. Would those of Mr. Gladstone's mind oppose it? Mr. Gladstone's position on Disestablishment is pretty well known. He is of opinion that, wherever a majority in a country want an Establishment, they ought to have it, and although professedly believing that when a majority do not want it they should not have it, he refuses to take any steps to win them this freedom. . . But two alternatives are before us, and only two: religious equality everywhere, or a Roman Catholic establishment in Ireland added to those already existing in Great Britain. Nor can there be any doubt that the Roman Catholic hierarchy would repeat their monstrous claims as to the education of the people, so that the main part of Ireland would pass at no distant date under a Roman Catholic domination. This would not be an evil in the opinion of most of the Irish members—it would be a great advantage. And we do not suppose Mr. Gladstone himself would take exception. Yet the result would be such a break up and confusion of the Liberal party as would put an end to reform for years, and have far-reaching effects in every direction."

The danger of oppressive legislation on the part of the Roman Catholic majority in the new Irish Parliament is well illustrated by a letter of Mr. Robert C. Jenkins, in the *Times* of February 27th, 1893:—

"Will you allow me to point out (as the second reading of the Home Rule Bill is so near) the serious fact in its so-called 'safeguards' it makes no provision whatever for those subjects of mixed jurisdiction over which the Roman Church claims an exclusive right, but which the State cannot surrender without endangering her very existence? Mr. Gladstone in his Vatican pamphlet observed truly that, while even in America the subjects of 'marriage, prison discipline, blasphemy, poor relief, incorporation, mortmain,' &c., lie within the limits of this mixed jurisdiction, 'in Europe the circle is far wider, the points of contact and of interlacing almost innumerable' (p. 41). Let us suppose that under priestly influence Bills had been passed in the Irish Legislature forbidding divorce or civil marriages, or bringing the prohibited degrees within the scope of a Papal dispensation, what is to prevent a conflict of laws and even of Parliaments on a question which lies at the very foundation of social life? From the time of the Council of Trent until that of the present pope these exclusive pretensions of the Church of Rome have been energetically put forth. If all these subjects of the 'mixed tribunal' are not withdrawn from the competence of the Irish Parliament we shall soon have a 'conflict

of laws' which Judge Story himself would have found it impossible to reconcile, and such a collision of Parliaments as might lead to still more serious complications."

THE BILL FATAL TO LOCAL SELF-GOVERNMENT.

Mr. Gladstone has complained that Ireland has not had the practice in local self-government that has been given to England and Scotland. That may be; but it is evident that his new Irish Parliament would be far more fatal to true local self-government in Ireland than the Imperial connection has been or could be. Mr. Gladstone begins at the wrong end, at the top instead of from beneath, in the localities themselves. His new Irish Legislature would be a carefully wire-pulled mechanism, acting under the control and at the dictation of a small self-controlled central band of organisers. It would paralyse local self-government rather than encourage it.

Mr. Goschen's remarks upon this subject deserve attention. He said in the House of Commons, on April 13th, 1886:—

"But one cardinal point which ought to lie at the basis of these schemes is that they should be applicable to Ireland, Scotland, and England. (Opposition cheers.) Remedial legislation is always spoken of. Does that remedial legislation mean that we are to grant Home Rule? If it means that we are to go further than the Land Act I confess I believe that the Land Act has landed Ireland in such a difficulty, that the knot has been tied in such an inextricable way, that it may be necessary to take remedial measures to relieve an intolerable situation. But what are the other remedial measures? I do not call Home Rule a remedial measure. (Opposition cheers.) I should call remedial measures increasing that which the Attorney-General calls parochial—increasing the powers of local government in Ireland on a large and not a parochial scale. But it appears to me that that which hon. members from Ireland chiefly desire—namely, *the establishment of a central political body in Dublin—will sap the foundations of local life in Ireland*, because it will be overruled by this central political body. For all local reformers know that it is from the centre that comes all the influence that prevents the development of local life. (Cheers.) I would far sooner build up in Ireland throughout the localities local and municipal bodies than in the first place have a central body which must be political from the circumstances of the case. We have had heroic legislation, as it was called, but it appears to me to have been legislation not of heroism, but of fear. (Opposition cheers.) The Prime Minister spoke of the constant vacillation that has taken place in the management of Irish affairs. What is wanted in the management of Irish affairs is clearly that this vacillation should cease, and that there should be some belief that England sometimes pronounces a last word. (Opposition cheers.) We have passed the Land Act, and two years afterwards it has had to be amended, and it has been amended upon pressure. We have passed the Land Purchase Act, and why does it not succeed? Because no time has been given to it, and we are again called upon to interfere. (Hear.) If this goes on, of course it is impossible to hope for anything except that the Irish will demand more and more, and how, then, can we think that this would be a final settlement? We shall give way now, as we have given way before, and check after check will vanish, until the Irish have done that which they desire to do—establish Ireland as a separate nation. That is their desire, and if the Irish people find that it is possible for England to be firm, firmness is called coercion. (Opposition cheers.) It is considered something fearful to coerce evildoers. They say, 'What remedy have you but a policy of repression?' But there will be no repression unless there is crime. (Opposition cheers.)"

Many members of the Liberal party who have not yet broken away from Mr. Gladstone are deceived, and deceive themselves, by vague phrases about "local self-government." In some cases we hear the expression, "an assembly at Dublin for purely local matters." This is the merest paltering with a great subject; it is the blindest self-deception as to what any kind of Home Rule for Ireland must mean. To imagine that a Parliament or assembly of any sort can be set up in Dublin without demanding, and, sooner or later, obtaining the control of Irish affairs, is to fly in the face of history, of human nature, and of the Irish character.

It has been said before that the Irish race is the "worst in the world to run away from." Their demands always increase with each fresh surrender. The Church, the land, freedom of contract, the authority of the Queen, the majesty of the law, the liberty of the subject, have one by one been conceded to the agitation; and still the cry is for more.

INJUSTICE TO POST OFFICE AND SAVINGS BANK INVESTORS.

The many thrifty persons, mostly belonging to the poorer class, who have invested their money in the Post Office and Trustee Savings Banks in Ireland are already showing great alarm at the prospect of having all Irish deposits handed over to the new Irish Government. They invested on the strength of having Imperial security, not only for the administration, but also for the capital of their funds in Government securities. Now they find that they are to be handed over to the tender mercies of an Irish Government, controlled by the leaders of the National League. Their feeling is well illustrated by a letter signed "Cassandra" which appeared in the *Irish Times* of March 2nd, 1893:—

"In the Trustee Savings Banks in Ireland there were, in 1891, 49,276 depositors to the amount of £1,988,882, and in the Post Office Savings Banks 212,076 depositors—amount, £3,878,000. These hard-earned savings are now invested in Consols, secured by the whole taxable property of the United Kingdom, with a gross annual revenue of over one hundred millions sterling. The whole of this sum of close on six millions sterling it is proposed by Clause 21, 'as from the appointed day'—that is, on 'the day of the first meeting of the Irish Legislature' (Clause 38), to transfer to the Irish Government, with its 'vanishing' surplus of £500,000. The British Exchequer, or, as it is ironically styled in the Bill, 'the Exchequer of the United Kingdom,' meanwhile secures to itself a first charge on the Irish Consolidated Fund for any claims which the Controller-General at Westminster is 'satisfied' are due, and until these claims are wholly paid no other payment is to be made out of the Irish Exchequer for any purpose whatever. Is this a security on which small investors are willing to risk their hard-earned savings, at 2½ per cent. per annum, in order to provide a working capital for the Irish Government Company, Limited, to begin its business on?"

APPEAL TO THE JUDICIAL COMMITTEE.

The Bill gives power in certain cases for a person aggrieved in person or property by act of the new Irish Government, to appeal to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in London. To this body also may be referred questions as to the validity of any Bill passed by the Irish Parliament. This is an attempt on the part of Mr. Gladstone to introduce something like the principle of a Supreme Court of the United States into the British constitution. The weakness and the confusion involved in the employment of such a tribunal is well illustrated by the author of the able article entitled "The Home Rule Bubble," in *Blackwood's Magazine* for March, 1893:—

"The committee will have to set the Home Secretary in motion, he in turn will have to appeal to the Viceroy, who may, if he can secure the consent of his Council, have the judgment of the Judicial Committee enforced. Such a system of legislative reference may answer in the United States, where the Supreme Court, like other Federal bureaus, has its own officers in every state of the Union to execute its decrees; but here such an expedient can only cause friction and end in failure. And, with the Irish party in Parliament, we should have the decisions of the Judicial Committee dragged into party warfare, and the highest tribunal in the country degraded in the popular estimation. Nothing can be more averse to the spirit of our constitution than to clothe a body that is purely judicial with an administrative faculty, and to introduce a spirit of party politics into juridical deliberations. This appeal to the Judicial Committee is one of the securities which Mr. Gladstone so ostentatiously puts forward; but for all the practical value that it will prove to the minority, the constitution might well have been spared the damage that seems likely to result from this reference."

It may be added that, while these restrictions have been quoted as borrowed from a recent amendment of the Constitution of the United States, the framers of the Bill have taken very good care to refrain from copying that fundamental provision of the American System (Article I., section 10, of the Constitution) which explicitly declares that *no State shall 'pass any Bill of attainder, ex post facto law, or law impairing the obligation of contracts.'* Under the Gladstonian Constitution, contracts may be and will be attacked. The rights of persons and of corporations are left without any real protection, for that of the Appellate Courts is practically worthless.

TRINITY COLLEGE.

What is to be the fate of Trinity College under the new arrangement? For many years the Irish Roman Catholic hierachy have longed to get control of that great University, with its rich endowments. According to Lord Ashbourne, Trinity College, with its religious freedom and its fine endowments, is to be left to the mercy of the Irish Parliament. So long ago as 1873, Mr. Gladstone, in order to placate the Roman Catholic Church, proposed to practically transform Trinity College and to

abolish the professorial chairs of Modern History and Modern Philosophy. These are studies which the Roman Church does not approve. The result was that, in 1874, Mr. Gladstone was badly beaten at the General Election.

THE SCHEME UTTERLY IMPRACTICABLE.

Mr. Arthur Balfour put the disturbing and unsettling character of the Bill in a very clear and striking light in his great speech in the House of Commons on Feb. 14th, 1893, in reply to Mr. Gladstone. He said of the Nationalists:—

"Are they likely even to find in this Bill the goal of their desires? They have never hesitated to tell us in the frankest manner what they desire. Even up to the last few months they have stated that they wish to see Ireland a nation among the nations of the world. (An Irish member: 'Hear, hear,' and laughter.) They look back to '98, '48, and '67—men who avowedly desired to lead to complete the separation as their ideal. Are they likely to be content with an arrangement, whatever protestations they may make—and their protestations appear now to be feeble—an arrangement which, according to the Bill, I presume would deprive them of any power of raising a volunteer force of any power of managing trade, any power of dealing with the great branches of taxation, any power of managing their own telegraphs and post-office, any power of dealing directly or indirectly with foreign powers. Are they likely to be content with a scheme which, in addition to these limitations, hampers their domestic legislation by a Legislative Council elected upon a high and arbitrary franchise? (Cheers.) Are they likely to approve of a scheme which gives to the Crown, on the advice of her British Ministers, the right to veto Irish Acts of Parliament? Are they likely to consent to a scheme which, if it preserves the Imperial supremacy at all; will certainly preserve it in a form in which it can be exercised when a Government is in power strong enough and courageous enough to exercise it? (Hear, hear.) You have stimulated the appetite of those gentlemen throughout all these six years. You told them that they are a nation—(cheers)—and that they deserve the treatment of a nation, and now you put them off with a constitution which not only does not make them a nation, but *which puts them immeasurably below the smallest self-governing colony in this great Empire.* How can you expect that they, at all events, whatever they may say in view of future contingencies—(laughter and cheers)—are really content with the measure of Home Rule you put before them? So much for Ireland. What is Britain's share of this balance-sheet of disaster? (Loud cheers.) We begin by paying 17 millions to these gentlemen for the privilege of wrecking our Constitution. (Cheers.) We deprive ourselves of all freedom in the management of our own taxation in the delicate matters with which taxation is concerned. We permit our deliberations to be maimed, and even rendered ridiculous, by Irish members who are to vote and are not to vote, who may take part in this debate and may not take part in that debate, who may turn out a Ministry and who may not vote on a Road Bill. (Loud cheers and laughter.)

"Above all, Britain gives up the prospect which has been held out to her that, at all events, we shall have peace from these Irish controversies, and that our own time shall be given to our own affairs. Can anything be more certain than that in the Bill you are going to lay on the table of the House *the Irish question, which has occupied three-fourths of our time, will occupy the whole of it!* (Loud cheers.) We shall have all the endless questions which now perplex us in the management of Irish affairs; we shall be asked, and asked with an insistance which a Ministry numerically weak can hardly refuse, to alter the constitution which you tell us is final. I confess that at first sight it might seem and has been to me a matter of surprise that seven years of careful meditation has only ended in producing this

strange abortion of a measure. (Laughter.) Surely those who are concerned in framing it are not deficient in either ingenuity or ability or zeal for the public good? I frankly admit it. Why, then, have they done no better than this? I will tell the House—because they have attempted an impossible task? (Loud cheers.) *A Federal Government may be good. Colonial Government may be good. The British Constitution as it stands may be good. But this bastard combination of the three* (loud laughter and cheers) *is a ludicrous impostor* (cheers), and the very attempt to force it down our throats appears to me to argue an ignorance of the past patent lessons of history which I am surprised at in gentlemen of the learning of those whom I see opposite me. (Cheers.)"

Anything more ridiculous or impracticable than the whole scheme cannot be conceived. It is impossible to believe that the Imperial Parliament, even with a nominal Gladstonian majority of forty, can ever pass into law so disturbing, preposterous, and destructive a scheme. Still less is it possible that the English people, when once they understand its real meaning and its thousand absurdities, will ever give such a plan their formal and deliberate approval. The direct verdict of the English people upon Mr. Gladstone's new scheme for separation will have to be taken by means of a General Election. The Unionist party are confident that the decision of England will be the same as it was in July 1886, when English electors had before them the details of Mr. Gladstone's former Bill.

MR. GLADSTONE'S CONVERSION.

The general process of Mr. Gladstone's conversion to the principle of Home Rule movement is remarkable and instructive. During a long public life, from 1833 to 1885, Mr. Gladstone persistently opposed all proposals for the appeal of the Union, or for the establishment of a separate Parliament in Dublin. He has frequently denounced and ridiculed such a policy in the strongest terms. What words could be more forcible, or a more clear condemnation of "Home Rule," than these which Mr. Gladstone used at Aberdeen on September 26, 1871:—

"This United Kingdom, which we have endeavoured to make a United Kingdom in heart as well as in law, we intend that it shall remain a United Kingdom.

. . . . . .

"We are told that it is necessary for Ireland to close her relations with the Parliament of this country, and to have a Parliament of her own. Why is Parliament to be broken up? Has Ireland any great grievances? What is it that Ireland has demanded from the Imperial Parliament, and that the Imperial Parliament has refused? (Cheers.) I have seen nothing, except that it is stated there is a vast quantity of fish in the seas that surround Ireland, and that *if they*

had Home Rule they would catch a great deal of these fish. But there are fish in the seas which surround England and Scotland. England has no Home Rule, and Scotland has no Home Rule, but we manage to catch the fish. (Cheers and laughter.) There is nothing that Ireland has asked and that this country and that this Parliament has refused *This Parliament has done for Ireland what it would have scrupled to do for England or for Scotland.* (Cheers.)

. . . . . .

"What are the inequalities of England and Ireland? I declare that I know none, except that there are *certain taxes* still remaining which *are* levied over Englishmen and Scotchmen, and which *are not* levied over Irishmen! and likewise that there are certain purposes for which public money *is* freely and largely given in Ireland, and for which *is not* given in England or Scotland. (Cheers.) That seems to me to be a very feeble case indeed for the argument which has been used, by means of which, as we are told, the fabric of the united Parliament of this country is to be broken.

"*Can any sensible man, can any rational man, suppose at this time of day—in this condition of the world—we are going to disintegrate the great capital institutions of this country for the purpose of making ourselves ridiculous in the sight of all mankind, and crippling any power we possess for bestowing benefits through legislation on the country to which we belong.*"

It was not till after the General Election of November, 1885, that Mr. Gladstone showed any signs of wavering on this great issue. In his appeal to the electors of Midlothian, just before that Election. Mr. Gladstone, in a striking and almost prophetic spirit, appealed to he British people to give him a clear majority, over and above, and independent of, the Irish vote. He realised the gravity of the position, and the force of the temptation to which he might be exposed if the Nationalist Party were to hold the balance of power. These were Mr. Gladstone's words spoken at Edinburgh, on Nov. 9th, 1885.

"Let me now suppose that the Liberal Party might be returned to the coming Parliament in a minority, but in a minority which might become a majority by the aid of the Irish vote: I will suppose that owing to some cause the present Government has disappeared, and a Liberal Party was called to deal with this great constitutional question of the government of Ireland in a position where it was a minority dependent upon the Irish vote to convert it into a majority. Now, gentlemen, I tell you seriously and solemnly, that *though I believe the Liberal party to be honourable, patriotic and trustworthy, in such a position as that it would not be safe for it to enter on the consideration of a measure* in respect to which at the first step of its progress, it would be in the power of a party coming from Ireland to say 'Unless you do this and unless you do that we will turn you out to-morrow.' (Cheers.)

. . . . . .

"We believe it is essential for the public welfare that the party which may have to deal with Mr. Parnell, or to check and virtually govern the dealings, with Mr. Parnell, should be a party not dependent upon his suffrages."

Lord Hartington and Mr. Chamberlain, then members of Mr. Gladstone's Ministry, distinctly repudiated a Separatist policy; and Sir William Harcourt heartily endorsed their statements in the following language at Plymouth, in September, 1885:—

"There has been a still more serious question than boycotting raised in Ireland; because since the declaration of Mr. Parnell, there can be no doubt what is the

policy that he and his party have adopted—*it is a policy of absolute separation of the two countries.* How has that declaration been met? Two speakers, eminently entitled to represent the Liberal party—Lord Hartington and Mr. Chamberlain—have spoken on this matter, and they have spoken in a manner worthy of their position, and worthy of the party they represent."

In December, 1885, speaking at Lowestoft, Sir William Harcourt professed the greatest indignation at the alleged alliance between the Conservative party and Mr. Parnell. The charge was false; but Sir William Harcourt's fury is very interesting in view of the fact that Sir William Harcourt has since done what he then untruly accused the Conservative party of doing. He said that a Parnellite alliance would not be tolerated by this country:—

"The Tories propose to govern the country by an intimate alliance with men who openly avow their object is the dismemberment of Ireland from England. Is it possible the country is going to tolerate such a transaction? Liberals must not be in a hurry to turn the Tories out. *I would let them for a few months stew in their own Parnellite juice*, and when they stink in the nostrils of the country, as they will stink, then the country will fling them, discredited and disgraced, to the constituencies, *and the nation will pronounce its final judgment upon them.* We shall hear no more of Tory reaction for many generations."

This has proved true, with the substitution throughout of the word "Gladstonian" for the word "Tory."

The eventuality, which Mr Gladstone so dreaded, came to pass. Although Mr. Gladstone, by his lavish promises to the agricultural electors, obtained a majority of 84 apart from the Parnellite vote, his party would have been in a minority had the Irish Nationalists voted against him. Mr. Gladstone at once succumbed to the temptation he had regarded with so much alarm. He decided to bribe the 85 Parnellites by the promise of a "Home Rule" scheme. In a communication to a Press Agency, at the end of December, 1885, Mr. Herbert Gladstone was reported to have said that his father was prepared to raise the question of Home Rule. This, though formally denied from Hawarden, was generally taken as a *ballon d'essai* in that question. The Conservative Government were overthrown by an amendment on the address, ostensibly in favour of the agricultural labourers. Nothing more tended to the Conservative re-conquest of the counties in 1886, than the anger and disgust of the labourers at finding themselves duped by the fictitious promises and limed expressions of interest that were so recklessly lavished upon them by the Liberal party in 1885. Lord Hartington, Mr. Goschen, Lord Selborne, and Sir Henry James, all distinctly declined to join the Government which Mr. Gladstone formed in January, 1886, because he would not formally repudiate "Home Rule."

The excitement in Parliament and among the public upon the subject of the Irish policy of the Government now grew intense.

Agitation in Ireland grew to a painful extent. The greatest alarm prevailed among the loyal population, and especially among those of British blood and Protestant faith. All Irish securities suffered severely—the price of bank and railway stock fell. Bank of Ireland Stock fell from 333 to 260. There was a general suspension of commercial operations. A similar fall has already begun in the Irish Securities during the fortnight following the introduction of the "Home Rule" Bill. On February 13th, 1893, the depreciation in the value of the stock of the Bank of Ireland and of the Ulster Bank, of the Irish Railways and of Guinness' Brewery amounted, according to Sir James Haslett, to no less than £1,845,750. Sir J. Haslett said at Belfast on February, 28th, 1893 :—

"The *Great Northern Railway stock* consisted of £3,469,117. On February 13th the value of the stock, or the selling price, was 142½, and on February 25th it was 130. The depreciation on the stock of the Great Northern, as between that day and the 12th was £329,564. (A voice : "That is Home Rule.") The *Great Southern and Western (Ireland)* ordinary capital was £4,970,455. On February 13th the selling price was 119, and on the 25th 112, a drop which represented a loss on the shares of that company of £217,459. The *Midland and Great Western of Ireland* ordinary capital was £2,370,000, and the price on February 13th was 104, and on the 25th 95, showing a loss on that stock of £154,050 Then as to the *Belfast and Northern Railway* stock, which represented £815,939 the price on the 13th was 124, while on the 25th it had fallen to 117, the loss on that small stock being £34,722. The stock of the *Belfast and County Down Railway* represented £295,950, and the price had fallen from 143 to 140, showing a loss of £8,878. Guinness' stocks represented £1,700,000. On February 13th this stock stood at 344, while on the 25th it had depreciated to 310, showing a net loss of £476,000. Let them turn to the *Bank of Ireland.* Those stocks amounted to £2,769,230, and on February 13th they stood at 317½, while on the 25th they had fallen to 301½, representing a loss of £443,077. Now he came to the *Ulster Bank*, than which a sounder commercial undertaking was not in Ireland. Its share capital was £450,000. Its stock stood on the 13th at 10⅜, and on the 25th it had fallen to 9¾, which represented a loss on that small stock capital of £160,000.

"Those stocks—and they were only a few which he had read out of them—represented, in that brief period of twelve days, a nett fall in value of £1,845,750, while the value of no Irish securities had been enhanced by the introduction of the measure."

Mr. Chamberlain and Sir George Trevelyan took office under Mr. Gladstone in Jan., 1886, but they resigned on March 26, as soon as his Home Rule scheme was formally adopted by the Gladstonian Cabinet. Mr. Chamberlain has since continued one of the keenest opponents of separation. Sir George Trevelyan, after fighting the election of July, 1886, as a Unionist, and denouncing "Home Rule" and the Irish Nationalists in unmeasured terms, became terrified by his defeat at Hawick, and promptly recanted his Unionist views.

Mr. Gladstone's conversion has been proceeding with painful rapidity since 1885. He has identified himself more and more

closely with the Nationalist leaders, whom he so severely condemned, from 1880 to 1885, as being mainly responsible for the terrible carnival of crime and outrage in Ireland during these years. He took Mr. Parnell into his confidence upon all Irish questions, and entertained him at Hawarden. Since Mr. Parnell's fall Mr. Gladstone has been equally familiar with men like Mr. John Dillon, Mr. T. M. Healy, Mr. Thomas Sexton, Mr. Michael Davitt, Mr. William O'Brien, and Mr. T. P. O'Connor, whom the famous Parnell Commission, composed of three impartial English judges of the highest character and standing, found guilty of the following charges :—

(1) That they, together with Mr. Davitt, "established and joined in the Land League organization with the intention by its means to bring about *the absolute independence of Ireland as a separate nation.*" [Mr. T. M. Healy was not included in this first charge.]

(2) Did *enter into a conspiracy by a system of coercion and intimidation* to promote an agrarian agitation against the payment of agricultural rents, for the purpose of impoverishing and expelling from the country the Irish landlords, who *were styled the "English Garrison."*

(3) Did disseminate the "Irish World" and other newspapers tending to incite to sedition and the commission of other crime.

(4) Did incite to intimidation, and that the consequence of that incitement was that crime and outrage were committed by the persons incited.

(5) Did make payments to compensate persons who had been injured in the commission of crime.

(6) Did invite the assistance and co-operation of and accepted subscriptions of money from Patrick Ford, a known advocate of crime and the use of dynamite.

(7) Invited and obtained the assistance and co-operation of the Physical Force party in America, including the Clan-na-Gael, and, in order to obtain that assistance, abstained from repudiating or condemning the action of that party.

To Messrs. Dillon, W. O'Brien, Sexton, and their colleagues, Mr. Gladstone gave pledges last August, in order to secure their votes for the overthrow of Lord Salisbury's Ministry. These pledges Mr. Dillon boasted of in his speech at Dublin on August 24th, 1892. Mr. Dillon then said :—

"To-day, all the machinery of administration, and all the immense power which gathers round the Executive Government, are practically speaking, in the hands of the Nationalists of Ireland."

His audience naturally received this with loud and prolonged cheers. Mr. Dillon then made a statement even more significant.

"We did not in the late debate force the hand of Mr. Gladstone to compel him to disclose the details of his Home Rule Bill, because we are in possession of understandings and agreements which in our judgment, if carried out, will satisfy the people of Ireland."

The proof of the first statement is seen in the deplorable, lawlessness, and terrorism that prevail in County Clare, and all fast developing in other districts. The proof of the second

statement has been given by Mr. Gladstone and Mr. John Morley, when they abrogated the action of the Crimes Act, formally sanctioned the National League, denied police protection to Sheriffs' Officers at night, released the Gweedore Murderers and two Dynamitards, and set up Sir James Mathews' prejudiced and absurd Evicted Tenants' Commission.

To these same promoters of lawlessness, Mr. Gladstone showed the text of his Home Rule Bill, while Parliament and the Country, and his own English supporters were kept in absolute ignorance of its provisions. Mr. Sexton in his speech in the House of Commons on February 13th, 1893, five days before the Bill was printed, displayed a more intimate acquaintance with the details of the Bill than the Prime Minister himself.

But Mr. Gladstone's conversion on the subject of the retention of the Irish members in the Imperial Parliament the most remarkable of his recent changes since the Great Betrayal of 1886. In his former scheme, the Bill of 1886, the exclusion of Irish members from the Imperial Parliament was described as one of the main attractions of the then Home Rule Plan. Mr. Gladstone strongly upheld the exclusion of the Irish members as a means of freeing the Imperial Parliament from their presence and obstruction. His chief reason, however, was the impossibility of distinguishing between Irish and Imperial affairs.

Mr. Gladstone in introducing his first Home Rule Bill on April 8, 1886, spoke as follows concerning the possibility of retaining the Irish members at Westminster for Imperial affairs:—

"Is it practicable for Irish representatives to come here for the settlement, not of English and Scotch, but of Imperial affairs? In principle it would be very difficult, I think, to object to that proposition. But then its acceptance depends entirely upon our arriving at the conclusion that in this House we can draw for practical purposes a distinction between affairs which are Imperial and affairs which are not Imperial. It would not be difficult to say in principle that as the Irish Legislature will have nothing to do with Imperial concerns, let Irish members come here and vote on Imperial concerns. All depends on the practicability of the distinction. Well, Sir, *I have thought much, reasoned much, and inquired much with regard to that distinction. I had hoped it might be possible to draw a distinction, and I have arrived at the conclusion that it cannot be drawn. I believe it passes the wit of man;* at any rate, it passes not my wit alone but the wit of many with whom I have communicated. It would be easy to exhibit a case; but the difficulty I may say, in my opinion arises from this. If this were a merely legislative House, or if the House of Lords were merely a legislative House—this House, of course, affords the best illustration—I do not think it would be difficult to draw a distinction. We are going to draw the distinction—we have drawn the distinction—in the Bill which I ask leave to lay on the table for legislative purposes with reference to what I hope will be the domestic Legislature of Ireland. But this House is not merely a legislative House; it is a House controlling the Executive; and when you come to the control of the Executive, then *your distinction between Imperial subjects and non-Imperial subjects totally breaks down*—they are totally insufficient to cover the whole case.

"For example, suppose it to be a question of foreign policy. Suppose the Irish members in this House coming here to vote on a question of foreign policy. Is it possible to deny that they would be entitled to take part in discussing an Address to the Crown for the dismissal of the Foreign Minister? It is totally impossible to deny—it is totally impossible to separate—the right of impugning the policy and the right of action against the Minister. Well, Sir, if on that account members might take part in an Address dismissing the Foreign Minister, I want to know, considering the collective responsibility of Government—a principle, I hope, which will always be maintained at the very highest level that circumstances will permit, for I am satisfied that the public honour and the public welfare are closely associated with it—if that be so, what will be the effect of the dismissal of the Foreign Minister on the existence and action of the Government to which he belongs? Why, Sir, the Government in 19 cases out of 20 will break down with the Foreign Minister; and when these gentlemen, coming here for the purpose of discussing Imperial questions alone, could dislodge the Government which is charged with the entire interests of England and Scotland, I ask you what becomes of the distinction between Imperial and non-Imperial affairs? I believe the distinction to be impossible, and therefore I arrive at the next conclusion—*that Irish members and Irish Peers cannot, if a domestic Legislature be given to Ireland, justly retain a seat in the Parliament at Westminster.*"

Now Mr. Gladstone retracts his former conviction and proposes to retain eighty Irish members in the Imperial Parliament. He does this in such a way and on such conditions as will enable them to decide the fate of Ministers, to intervene in debate on most subjects, and to constantly harass and practically control the Imperial Parliament and the Imperial Government. It is by no means impossible that Mr. Gladstone may undergo another conversion, and propose to revert to the Scheme of 1886, by which the Irish members were excluded from the Imperial Parliament.

BREACH IN THE NATIONALIST PARTY.

Vide Appendix VII.

The absurdity of the demand for "Home Rule" has been made much more patent of late by the breach of the Irish Nationalist party itself. There is not even a majority of the Irish Separatists agreed upon any one policy or scheme of Home Rule.

In 1886 it might have been said that 85 Irish Nationalist members, representing some three millions of disloyal Irish Roman Catholics, were united under Mr. Parnell in demanding "Home Rule."

But what is the case now? The Nationalist party is split up into two factions, who hate and revile each other even more fiercely than the whole Nationalist party used to hate and revile Mr. Arthur Balfour and the British Administration. This split began in Committee Room No. 15, in November, 1890, and it has raged with increasing violence ever since.

The electoral contests held before the General Election at Kilkenny, at Cork, and at Waterford, between Parnellites and anti-Parnellites, were attended with furious rioting and most vituperative abuse directed by Irish Nationalists against each other. The Cork election resembled a battlefield. Hundreds of persons were injured. But for the presence and active intervention of British soldiers and of the Royal Irish Constabulary, there would have been terrible bloodshed and general anarchy. But for the active and constant protection of the Royal Irish Constabulary, "Balfour's Hellhounds," and of British Soldiers and Resident Magistrates, the much abused "Removables," Mr. Timothy Healy would have hanged to every lamp post in Dublin, and Mr. William O Brien, Mr. John Dillon, and Mr. Michael Davitt would have been stoned or bludgeoned to death in Cork and Waterford. Some delighted examples of the fury of these opposing factions were reported in the *Times* of July 1st, 1892.

A meeting of the supporters of Mr. W. Pearson, the anti-Parnellite candidate for the St. Stephen's-green Division of Dublin, who is opposing Mr. W. Kenny, Q.C. (Liberal Unionist), and the Lord Mayor (Parnellite), was held last night under the presidency of the Rev. Dr. Burke. Amongst the speakers was the Rev. Father Behan, who was frequently interrupted by a body of Parnellites. Referring to the disturbances in the hall, he said:— "Will you rowdies come up here and sit in front so that we may see you? (A voice—'Not likely, we would be afraid of being inspected.') I insist that the passage down there shall be cleared." (A voice.—"Then call in the police and have it cleared, and don't be intimidating.") A cheer was then given for the Independent party. Father Behan, making himself heard with great difficulty, said the hall had been taken for him and his friends, and the rowdies down there had better take care. (Laughter and cheers.) "*I tell you*,' *he added*, "*you base lot of old scoundrels at the end of the room, I would flog you out of it.* (Groans and a voice, 'Not you, the day for that sort of thing is gone by.' Loud cheers.) "It is not gone by; I will do it. You are the agents of intimidation and of infamy. *Remember the officers of the peace are public servants, and we will call them into the room and bludgeon every one of you.* (Groans.) I say the men who have organized this factionism are the greatest scoundrels ever before known in history." (Groans.) Great uproar ensued, the people screaming and using defiant epithets. Father Burke, who was received with some show of respect, claimed a hearing, and, a lull occurring, Father Behan resumed, and said he had a little story to tell them. Nineteen hundred years ago a man named Herod made an oration. His blasphemous followers when they heard him said, "It is the voice of God that speaks." He was struck dead. "Parnell," he continued, "is constantly flung in our faces. *Well, I detest that man's memory.* (Loud groans and some cheers.) He has been a curse to himself and a curse on us. (Shouts of "No.") I say that God Almighty has revealed His will it thrusting that man into his grave. *His bones are rotting, his flesh is putrid, his spirit is dead, and detestable though dead.* (Loud groans.) I say you ruffians I would not have made these statements had it not been for your action. (Loud groans.) You say you love Ireland, I say you hate Ireland." (A voice.—"God save Ireland," and cheers.) The rev. gentleman proceeded in the same strain for some time, and said that every blackguard, every drunkard, every man who would like to beat his wife, these were the Parnellites. (Groans.) "Every virtuous man," he concluded, "is on our side, and whether we fail in this contest or not we will, all

over the country when we are your masters, crush you when we get the power.' (Loud groans.) Cheers were then given for the Lord Mayor, the dead chief, and others. The Chairman, amid great uproar, said he was a priest, but he was also a man, and he warned the people who had come to break up the meeting that the priest might disappear and the man would step in. If they did not immediately cease he would give the word and physical force would be used. (Derisive cheers, and a voice—"*Send for the police, of course.*") The Rev. Dr. Burke asked them in the love they bore for Ireland—(A voice—"Bosh," and groans.) The chairman ultimately induced some of the Parnellites to leave the hall, and Mr. Pearson was then heard.

Dr. Tanner, protected by 100 police, made several attempts to address a meeting at Tuam yesterday. *The platform from which he was to address the meeting was seized by the independent party*, who hung a portrait of the late Mr. Parnell on the front of it, and when Dr. Tanner and his party arrived they found the supporters of Colonel Nolan in possession. *Dr. Tanner* made several attempts to get on the platform, *but each time he was knocked down.* The police, under the command of Mr. M'Lean, resident magistrate, came to his rescue; a free fight took place, the police batoning in all directions. All the shops were closed, and *Dr. Tanner had to be protected by police with fixed bayonets.*

Colonel Saunderson, speaking in the House of Commons on February 2nd, quoted some epithets applied by Mr. Timothy Healy, at Louth, on January 29th, 1893, to Mr. William Redmond.

Last Sunday the hon. member for Louth, accompanied, I think, by eighteen priests—(laughter)—stood on a platform to praise the gentlemen whom he hoped to see returned, and to say very uncivil things about his former friends. I always read with interest the speeches of these gentlemen, because they are those of hon. members who aspire to conduct the affairs of Ireland. They have known each other for many years, and when they give vent to their views as to their varied qualifications and disqualifications, I imagine they ought to know something about the matter. (Laughter.) The hon. member for Louth, speaking about a gentleman who, I imagine, aspires to a distinguished position in the Irish House of Commons, said:—"Jackasses of the Billy Redmond type—(loud laughter, and 'Order')—who hardly have as much sense as a hen—(laughter)—and who are about as fit to be trusted to argue the great constitutional cause of Ireland as a baby squalling in the arms of its nurse." (Laughter.) These are the men who aspire to govern Ireland. (Cheers.) Why, then, did the hon. member for Louth describe his colleague in those uncomplimentary terms? The hon. member must have known him all along. (Laughter.) Personally, I express no opinion on the subject. (Laughter.) I leave the hon. member for Clare to settle it satisfactorily with the hon. member for Louth; but these gentlemen pose before the country and the House of Commons as fit men to govern Ireland, and it is important to hear one of the leaders of one party thus describe one of the leaders of the other party. (Laughter.)

Instead of a united Nationalist party of 85 members opposing the 18 Loyalist members, there are now two furiously antagonistic Nationalist parties, who numbered in the last Parliament respectively about 34 and 51 members, and in the present Parliament 71 to 9. These two Home Rule parties denounce and attack each other more savagely than they attack the Loyalists and the British Government. On the one side are the Parnellites and Fenians; on the other side the Priests and the anti-Parnellites.

The anti-Parnellites are themselves split up into various opposing factions. Mr. Timothy Healy, supported by the Priests,

leads one faction; Messrs. John Dillon, William O'Brien and others, who hate Mr. Healy almost as much as they hate Messrs. Redmond and Harrington, the leaders of the Parnellite party, lead another faction.

The scenes that took place in Dublin in May, 1892, between Mr. John Dillon and Mr. Timothy Healy in connection with the *Freeman's Journal*, are typical of what would happen in a Nationalist Parliament. The Nationalists have now no leader and no real union among themselves. There is no undivided section of them that would muster anything like the number of the loyalists in Ireland. In quality—in intelligence, industry, wealth, courage, and tenacity—the Nationalist factions all combined, are not comparable to the Irish Loyalists. What could be more suggestive than the following episode:—

The Nationalists held a meeting at Mitchelstown on Sunday, November 22nd, 1891, which was addressed by Mr. John Dillon and Mr. William O'Brien, and heard this remarkable resolution which was passed at that meeting, namely:—

"That, while we indignantly repudiate the allegation that the Irish cause is to be made 'subservient' to the emergencies of English Liberalism, *we consider it prudent and patriotic to trust for the time being to the promises of the Grand Old Man*, reserving to ourselves the right to refuse any Home Rule Bill, from any source whatever, derogatory to the honour of Ireland."

It is not then monstrous, in view of the vital interests of Great Britain that are involved in the Union, in view of the duty we owe to our loyal fellow-countrymen in Ireland, and in view of the discreditable and hopeless factions among the Nationalists themselves, to set up a separate Parliament in Dublin? Such a Parliament must be the scene of disgraceful disputes and contests. It must lead to the oppression of the loyalists of Ulster, and still more certainly to the persecution of the Loyalists throughout the rest of Ireland; and it must culminate in a destructive civil war.

IRELAND HAS NO REAL GRIEVANCES.

A separate Parliament is not needed in the interests of Ireland, or of any section of the Irish people. The 1,750,000 loyalists absolutely reject such a change. The history of the six years from 1886 to 1892 proves that Ireland can obtain peace and prosperity without such a Parliament. As Mr. John Bright wrote in June, 1886:—"No separate Parliament sitting at Dublin

Vide Appendix VIII.

"can be so just and so generous to the Irish people as the "Imperial Parliament sitting at Westminster."

The Imperial Parliament has given freely of its time and efforts to ameliorate the condition of the Irish people. Since 1886 it has passed two Land Acts, a Light Railways Act, Drainage Acts, Relief Acts, and two Ashbourne Acts. Finally, the Imperial Parliament passed, in 1891, a splendid Land Purchase Act, which, *without any risk to the British Taxpayer*, enables every Irish tenant to become the owner of the land he cultivates, in a limited number of years, and for an annual payment of much less than his present rent.

Ireland has no practical grievances; her laws are more favourable to the cultivator than are the laws of any country in the world. Ireland is prosperous and increasing in wealth, and the great majority of the Irish people are perfectly satisfied. All that Ireland needs are peace and freedom—peace from the agitator and the outragemonger, freedom from the reign of terror which the Nationalist party set up in 1880, 1881 and 1882, and would have re-established in 1887, but that Mr. Balfour's courageous administration checkmated their efforts.

The English people have proved themselves most willing to render full justice to Ireland. They are justified in drawing the line at separation, and bound to say in emphatic and unmistakable terms, "Thus far and no farther."

PRACTICAL OUTCOME OF "HOME RULE."

What would be the practical consequences, if the scheme for a separate Irish Parliament proposed by Mr. Gladstone were carried into effect? To summarise them these results would be:—

1. A fierce struggle between the Celtic and Roman Catholic Nationalists on the one hand, and, on the other, the Loyalists of Ulster, whose British blood, Protestant religion, and love for liberty render them determined not to submit to the dictation of the Rebel Party and Archbishop Walsh. A civil war, between Irishmen, can only be averted if Great Britain is prepared to allow the employment of British soldiers to enforce upon their loyal brethren in the north of Ireland the coercion which Mr. Gladstone and his colleagues would decline to enforce against the law-breaking and seditious advocates of separation.

2. If the Loyalists are overwhelmed by the employment of British troops to coerce them, this internecine war will be followed by a period of constant dispute and increasing

antagonism between the Imperial Parliament and the Irish legislature, during which the Irish will demand one by one, and will obtain, unless resisted by force of arms, all the powers of a sovereign and independent legislature. The control over the Customs, Military Forces, External Trade, Navigation, the right of interference in foreign policy, the right of dealing with religious education and religious establishment, are certain to be exacted by an Irish Parliament.

3. With equal certainty will there come an unappeasable quarrel over some vital question upon which Great Britain cannot possibly yield without national and Imperial ruin. This quarrel will probably be forced upon England at a crisis when the Empire is gravely menaced by foreign enemies. Irishmen have not been slow to remind us that England's peril will be Ireland's opportunity. Then there must ensue between the two countries a bloody and disastrous war, in which thousands of lives will be sacrificed and millions of treasure wasted, and as a result of which Ireland will be again conquered. Both countries may receive irreparable injury.

4. The sure accompaniment of this policy of disruption will be a vast increase in the expenditure of Great Britain, military and otherwise, and a heavy additional burden upon British tax-payers. Ireland will be convulsed and trade destroyed. Not only Irish capitalists, but thousands of Irish labourers will be driven over to England to escape starvation. Just as surely as the sun goes round will these be the results of an Irish Parliament, whether it be at first given great or small powers.

THE TRUE REMEDY.

All this trouble, danger, bloodshed, and waste of resources will result from the adoption of a Separatist policy, in Ireland, for which no real cause exists, or has been advanced. Did not the six years of Unionist government, from 1886 to 1892, prove that it is infinitely more prudent, better for Ireland as well as for this country, to exercise the small degree of courage and firmness needful to restore the majesty of the law?

Did not the success of Mr. Balfour's Irish administration demonstrate that it was wiser and more just to free the Queen's subjects in Ireland from the odious coercion of a disloyal and dishonest conspiracy, rather than to deliberately create for the foes of England a tremendous lever, which they would certainly use against us, and perhaps with fatal effect?

It used to be said that the country was weary of perpetually recurring lawlessness and revolution in Ireland. But let not the British people, out of such disgust and weariness, suffer them-

selves to be led by false guides into a sham remedy tenfold worse than the disease. Ireland has been in the past—though not necessarily so, as the Unionist Government, from 1886 to 1892, clearly proved—a difficulty to us—possibly a disgrace. But, give Ireland Home Rule, and we do not rid Great Britain of the difficulty. We only add to it a hundredfold. We turn what is at worst a trouble, a worry and a sore, only requiring consistent firmness for its cure, into a real and terrible danger, which it might take all the resources of the Empire to heal. The real problem is not in Ireland—it is in this country. It lies in the selfish partisanship of too many of our politicians, in the narrow and pernicious rivalry which makes the well-being of Ireland, the maintenance of order and the unity of the Empire, all subservient to the selfish exigencies of parties in Parliament. Ireland was far too long the shuttlecock between opposing politicians in this country. What the Irish people need is governing—the unrelaxed and resolute, but kind, and statesmanlike grip with which Lord Beaconsfield grasped the helm from 1874 to 1880, and with which Lord Salisbury and Mr. Balfour administered Irish affairs for the six years following upon July 1886.

It is the fitful alternation from wild licence to fierce coercion, the weak drifting at one moment, followed by drastic repression the next, that, under Mr. Gladstone, deprived the Irish question of all hopes of finality, that gave the reins to sedition and outrage, that paralysed the law and obstructed national progress, and that took the heart out of thousands who would, if they had only dared, have been loyal subjects of the Queen. Let Englishmen of all parties realise that they must pursue a firm and uniform policy towards Ireland, and act in accordance with such a general principle, and the Irish trouble would be set at rest for ever.

As Mr. Goschen well said in 1886 :—

"The Prime Minister (Mr. Gladstone) says : 'We cannot go on with a policy of hand to mouth.' I entirely agree with him. I wish we had not so long gone on with a policy of hand to mouth. (Cheers.) The hungering maw of Irish discontent has been fed too long with sops out of the Imperial hand. (Cheers.) There must be a change in that respect. It is said that everything has been tried. No, everything has not been tried. (Cheers.) We have not yet tried a policy. (A voice, 'Home Rule.') We have not tried a policy of continuity, a policy of combined firmness and fairness, of patience and of patriotism (cheers), and of suppression of the trafficking with the Irish vote. (Cheers.) That has not yet been tried : and we have still to see what would be the effect on the Irish mind if they knew that the British public had the same tenacity as they themselves. We have yet to see what the effect upon their minds would be if they knew that we are not prepared to set no limits to our concessions except the limits which they themselves will set to their demands. (Hear, hear.) The Irish have not yet learned that, but they will learn it in time if we stand to our guns (cheers) ; and that is the appeal that we shall have to make to the British people.'

The experiment which Mr. Goschen prophetically counselled in 1886 has since been tried for 6 years, with the result that Ireland was peaceful, prosperous and contented when Lord Salsbury left office in August last.

UNION IS STRENGTH.

On the very threshold of this great question we are confronted by the startling fact that these separatist proposals are an absolute reversal of the policy which has in the past made this country great and powerful, and which is in our own time making other nations strong and prosperous. Hitherto it has been the aim and the pride of British Statesmen to build up, consolidate, and unite the power and dominions of their country. For the first time in British history it is proposed to disunite, separate, and disintegrate. Germany, Italy, and the United States afford most conspicuous examples of the great benefit to nations themselves and to the world at large of unification and Imperial union. The German, the Italian, and the American people have strengthened and consolidated their own forces and territories. They have resisted and fought against all disintegrating tendencies at home and abroad. Vide p. 15.

The lessons of history, and the practical experience of our own age, prove that union and consolidation of power mean force and stability for governments and peoples. In every case unity has given increased force, increased repute, and increased national prosperity. During the Middle Ages France, step by step, consolidated her separate provinces and divisions into one kingdom, and France grew in strength with each increase of unity. Much the same consolidation took place in Spain and with similar results. The present generation has witnessed the achievement of the unity of Italy, the Imperial union of Germany, and the maintenance and strengthening of the union of the United States of America. The union of Italy under a Constitutional and patriotic monarchy has been a benefit to the Italians and to Europe. Italian national power and prosperity have greatly increased, and Italy instead of being a mere "geographical expression," as Mr. Gladstone described her condition before 1860, now stands high among the nations of the world. German unity has created a marvellous change, and a change for good, in the polity of Europe. The brilliant genius and courage of Prince Bismarck, and the high character and resolute patriotism of King William of Prussia, welded together into one great nation the diverse and often antagonistic states that formerly represented what is now United Germany.

To preserve their Union the American people only 30 years ago undertook and carried to the bitter end the most terrible, costly, and sanguinary struggle of modern times. The result of that war was the re-establishment of the American Union, and the wiping out of the curse of slavery from among that great people. In 1863 Mr. Gladstone declared himself in favour of the Separatists of the Southern States, just as he supports the Irish Separatists in 1893. He is even more wrong now in his Separatist policy for the United Kingdom, than he was then in his Separatist policy for the United States. In the face of these striking facts, and at a time when every other great nation far and near is closing up its ranks, consolidating its power, and achieving greater unity, are we alone to enter upon the fatal path of separation and disunion ?

Shall this ancient and Imperial nation, parent of constitutional freedom, pioneer of civilisation and mistress of world wide dominion, sacrifice its unity and strength in order to gratify a sordid conspiracy, and to maintain a tottering Ministry and a heterogeneous party in office.

BAD PRECEDENTS TO BE SHUNNED.

AUSTRIA AND HUNGARY.

Precedents of ill-omen have been sometimes given by Mr. Gladstone and his supporters in favour of his separatist scheme. Strange, indeed, has it been to hear Mr. Gladstone quoting in favour of dismemberment the two empires which he has most constantly attacked and reviled during the past fifteen years. Turkey and Austria are curious exemplars for a British statesman to cite as precedents for the disruption of the Empire. Austria is certainly not the safest or most cohesive Power in Europe. Her centrifugal forces are enormous. The rivalries of Hungarian, and Slav, and German are for ever threatening to break up the Austrian Empire. Two great influences have of more recent years given Austria more cohesion than she had before. The hostile pressure of Russia on the East, and the friendly pressure of Germany on the north, have served to knit the subjects of the Austrian Crown together. Mr. Gladstone showed in his Home Rule speech of 1886 a deplorable ignorance of the real conditions of the dual Austro-Hungarian Government, which he cited as a precedent in favour of his own scheme.

On January 31st, 1893, Mr. Gladstone again, in reply to Mr. Balfour, was rash enough to say he would show that every Empire which has "adopted those principles [that is Home Rule],

and resolutely proceeded with them has been strengthened." Mr. Gladstone then quoted Austria; but he did not proceed to point his illustration in any way, nor did he give any other cases to prove his valiant defiance. Austria, as everyone knows, is the weakest of the Great European Powers, and Austria is weak, primarily and solely because the principle and the canker of separation prevails. Austria is not really a nation or solid State. The Austrian Empire is an agglomeration of different races, interests, and principalities, bound together, and very loosely bound together, by the tie of allegiance to a common Sovereign. Moreover, the principle of separation once started in Hungary is steadily gaining ground in other portions of the Empire. Bohemians, Croatians, Ruthenians, Galicians, all want more and more autonomy. Indeed, so fast is this fatal tendency spreading, that it is becoming impossible to form any sort of a majority in the Austrian Parliament. The instance of Austria is therefore an example that tells against, and not for, the principle of separate Parliaments. And yet Austria is the best example that can be quoted; there are no others.

There is no analogy between Mr. Gladstone's separate Irish Legislature and the Hungarian Constitution, or between the Irish themselves and the Hungarians. Hungary has a Parliament, but it is in every way on an equal footing with the Austrian Parliament, co-ordinate, and not inferior, as the new Irish Parliament would be. But there is an enormous difference in the Austrian Constitution. Three most important Ministers act for the two kingdoms, and are freed from the control of either Parliament. The Ministers of War, Common Expenses, and Foreign Affairs for Austria and Hungary are appointed by the Monarch and are responsible to the Monarch alone. The difference between the Hungarians and the Irish is most marked in every way. The Hungarians are a homogeneous, loyal, and chivalrous people, of one creed, and possessing a powerful and popular landed aristocracy. The Hungarian magnates form an Upper House as weighty and powerful as any in the world. The Hungarians have for centuries been the most devoted supporters of the Austrian Crown, even when hostile to the German connection. But even with all these advantages the dual Government has over and over again paralysed the foreign policy of Austria, and rendered her influence inactive when its vigorous exercise was most needed. Croatia, which is a Slav principality attached to Hungary, has tried to exact a separate Parliament of its own. It has obtained a kind of autonomy with a separate diet and a representation in the Hungarian Parliament. But constant friction prevails, embarrassing disputes are always arising. It is only by the exercise

of almost autocratic repression by the Banus, who resembles the Irish Viceroy, that outward peace is preserved. Croatia would be strong precedent for giving a separate Parliament to Ulster. The Separatist tendencies of the Bohemian Slavs have also brought Government in Bohemia to a dead-lock. Moreover, the presence of the Russian power, which the Hungarians detest above all others, keeps them steady and united to German Austria. On the contrary, the only foreign influence that would affect Ireland if she had a separate Legislature, would be certainly that of the Irish-Americans, and probably that of the French. Either of these would exert a powerful influence against England and against Irish Union with Great Britain. So that the effect of foreign pressure is in the two cases exactly opposite.

THE EXAMPLE OF CROATIA.

The Vienna Correspondent of the *Standard*, wrote, in that paper of February 15th, 1893:—

"Judging by the report of Mr. Gladstone's speech, it would appear that the second Home Rule Bill has been modelled on the Croatian Home Rule Act of 1868. The parallel between Croatia and Ireland is very striking. The proportion of the population of Croatia to that of the whole Hungarian Kingdom was in 1891, 12·60 per cent.; that of Ireland to the United Kingdom was 12·49. The connection of Croatia with the Crown of Hungary dates from 1091; that of Ireland with the English Crown from 1172. Croatia consists of two nations: the Croats, who are Roman Catholics, and the Serbs, who are Greek Orthodox, in the proportion of three to one, as with the Catholics and Protestants in Ireland. The points of similarity are, therefore, considerable; but Mr. Gladstone has departed from the analogy in some important particulars, which, if ever his Bill becomes law, will be the source of serious differences between England and Ireland. These dangers Francis Deák, the great Hungarian patriot, who drew up the Croatian Home Rule Constitution, wisely foresaw and cleverly avoided.

"The principle in the Croatian and the Irish Bill is exactly the same. The equivalent of the Irish Viceroy in Croatia is the Banus; the Executive Council is formed in Croatia by the Secretaries for the Home Department, Education, Public, Worship, and Justice, and Croatia sends forty members to the Lower Hungarian Chamber, who vote only when Imperial matters affecting the entire Hungarian Kingdom are under discussion. But there are some important differences in Mr. Gladstone's Bill. The latter provides for the appointment of the Viceroy direct by the Crown for a fixed term of six years, whereas under the Croatian Act the Banus is appointed by the Crown on the responsibility of the Hungarian Premier. Consequently, the Hungarian Cabinet is answerable to Parliament for the nomination. Again, the number of the Croatian Deputies in the Hungarian Chamber is not based on population, and they are sent by the Croatian Diet as a Delegation to the Hungarian Parliament; whereas the eighty Irish members are to be directly returned by Irish constituencies. The Croatians in the Hungarian Chamber vote according to the wishes of the majority of the Croatian Diet; the Irish members at Westminster would represent both the Ministerialists and the opposition in Ireland."

And again on Feb. 17th, 1893, the same correspondent wrote:—

"It will naturally be asked *how Croatian Home Rule has worked*, and whether it has conduced to peace and contentment between the Hungarian and Croatian nations.

The answer is that when the Croatian Act had been in force fifteen years *Hungary was compelled to send Austro-Hungarian troops into the country to quell a threatened rising*, and to appoint a general in the Austrian army to the office of Banus. Even now, ten years later *movements directed against Hungary by a party which has its confederates in Russia, France*, and at the Vatican can be *kept down only by the Draconic measures of the present Banus and his Executive Council, by the confiscation of newspapers, the prohibition of meetings, and Governmental pressure at elections*. The result is that the Croatians have far less liberty than they would have under direct Hungarian rule."

TURKEY.

Turkey affords a still more ill-omened precedent. It is an astounding proof of Mr. Gladstone's absence of humour that he should have held up the fate of an empire that he has never wearied of describing as rotten, decaying and moribund, to be the model for British disintegration. Mr. Mundella, blindly following his leader's cue, with even less knowledge, called upon the astonished electors of Ipswich in 1886 to admire the blessings that autonomy had conferred upon Bulgaria and Eastern Roumelia. He forgot to remind them that, however much the Bulgarians may have benefited by self-government, the Turkish Empire has not been thereby strengthened, but rather the reverse. It is the example of Turkey that Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Mundella wish this ancient and powerful Empire to follow. In the case of Turkey, every single grant of autonomy to a subject province has resulted in its complete separation from the Ottoman Empire and in the grievous enfeeblement of Turkey. This was the case with Roumania, Servia, Bulgaria, and Eastern Roumelia, all of which are now quite, or nearly separate and independent States. The English people would rather not have the British Empire follow the downward course of the Empire of Turkey.

SWEDEN AND NORWAY.

Other examples have been cited, *e.g.*, of Norway and Sweden, about which Mr. Gladstone's information was as faulty as were his ideas upon Austria-Hungary. An isolated and third-rate state like Sweden and Norway could at best afford no real parallel for the guidance of the British Empire. But Mr. Gladstone's *couleur de rose* description of the results of separate Parliaments in these countries was wholly imaginary. A correspondent wrote to the *Standard* in 1886:—

"As usual Mr. Gladstone has viewed the political situation in Sweden and Norway through the medium of his own wishes. Permit me, who have had a long and intimate acquaintance with both these countries, to assert that, so far from there being any bond of sympathy whatever between the two nations (if you like to call them so), they cordially hate and detest each other. I do not believe that, if it were a question of war to-morrow, Norway would lift her little finger in aid of Sweden, unless she were absolutely compelled to do so in her own interests. Norway, as the weaker of

the two countries, and to a certain extent beneath the control of Sweden, cherishes precisely the same groundless feeling of jealousy and revenge as animate a certain portion of the inhabitants of Ireland. If you were to take the map of the world, I do not know were Mr. Gladstone could have laid hands upon a more unhappy instance of brotherly love. The Swedes think themselves immeasurably superior to the Norwegians, and no doubt they are in many ways. The Norwegians are forced by circumstances over which they have no control to submit, and fortunately for them there is no Parnellite or Gladstone party strong enough to egg them on to rebellious designs. If the danger did assume a serious aspect, the Swedes would simply march across the frontier and settle the question at once and for ever."

Since this letter was written, the Separatist tendencies in Norway have greatly developed, the Norwegians, who already have complete autonomy, resent even the control of foreign affairs by a Swedish Minister, and demand a separate Foreign Minister of their own. They refuse to accept any union, except the link of the Crown. At any moment the slender thread that binds Norway to Sweden may be snapped.

The *Pall Mall Gazette* of February 15th, 1893 well said :—

"We are twitted with Germany, forsooth, as if Prussia had crowned Hanover and Brunswick with autonomy and not annexed them with an iron hand. We are confronted with Austria-Hungary, we are referred scornfully to Norway and the States of America. Is Ireland upon the same footing as Norway? We print an article to-day in which Björnson pleads for the absolute independence of his country. Norway has Home Rule, and she accepted it as final. But now, it seems, it was merely 'as an instalment,' and she clamours for entire separation. In truth, Norway is the best proof of our contentions—an object-lesson which should be written large upon every hoarding in England. . . There is nothing to excuse the proposition. No justice demands Home Rule. If the ancient kingdom of Kent should make a demand for liberty to manage its own affairs, if East Anglia, if Northumbria, if any sept of the Heptarchy, would justice require us to yield? And, for all the Nationalist laughter, Ireland is, as Mr. Balfour called it, an 'arbitrary geographical area,' or if it be not so, then neither is Ulster. Northumbria is ruled not by her own representatives, but by those of all the kingdom. So, too, is Ireland. And Northumbria has had far fewer gifts at the hands of Parliament than Ireland."

The following letter from the *Times'* correspondent in Berlin, dated March 5th, 1893, shows what aggravated disputes Separation is giving rise to at this moment in Sweden and Norway :—

"The plan of campaign against Sweden will be opened this week in the Storthing by a resolution to be moved in the course of the debate on the Speech from the Throne. This resolution seeks to establish the right of Norway to independent action with regard to all matters not specifically reserved in the Act of Union between the two kingdoms, and demands that in accordance with the vote of the Storthing of June 10th, 1892, *the Norwegian Government shall proceed with* the measures necessary for the establishment of *a separate consular service for Norway.*

"The precedent upon which the Committee of the Radical majority who drafted the resolution relies is drawn from the circumstances which preceded the abolition of the Royal lieutenancy. In 1860 the Storthing passed a resolution requesting the King to abrogate the article in the "Fundamental Law" of Norway empowering him to appoint a Swedish lieutenant to reside in Christiania as representative of the Royal authority. Although the King was disposed to make this concession, the

opposition it provoked in Sweden was so general that the King withheld his consent. In the following year the Storthing remonstrated in a strongly-worded address denying the right of the Swedish Parliament to interfere with regard to modifications of the Norwegian Fundamental Law. No further steps were, however, taken in the matter till the present King came to the throne in 1872. The Storthing then drew up a fresh address on the subject setting forth the wishes of the Norwegian people, to which King Oscar at once gave effect.

The proposed resolution ignores the recent Swedish overtures for the settlement of the vexed questions at issue between the two kingdoms, including the larger one of joint conduct of foreign affairs."

THE SELF-GOVERNING COLONIES.

Our self governing Colonies were also cited in favour of an Irish Parliament. But these colonies are all thousands of miles away, whereas Ireland is less than four hours' steaming from our greatest sea-ports. The strategical position of Ireland commanding the English Channel, St. George's Channel and our great western seaports of Glasgow, Liverpool and Bristol, is so vitally important that it would be madness for Great Britain to run the risk of having a semi-independent authoritive government in Ireland. Valuable as are the Colonies to the parent country, and precious as the links that still bind them to England are to every patriot, the loss of no single colony could be a fatal injury to these kingdoms. So far distant are they, and so self-contained are their chief interests, that, much as separation would be deplored, the mother country might probably accept the clear determination of a colony for independence without armed resistance. Besides, in the constitution of our Colonies there are none of the intolerable restrictions and anomalies of which Mr. Gladstone's Irish scheme is full. The Colonial legislatures are practically sovereign, though nominally under the superior authority of the Imperial Parliament.

Mr. Courtney, speaking in the House of Commons on Feb. 17th, 1893, gave some very valuable illustrations as to the powerlessness of the veto in the British Colonies :—

"When the Australian Government in New South Wales took action with respect to the admission of Chinese—action which was in some respects in violation of our treaty relations—the Home Government remonstrated and attempted to use some influence to have this policy counteracted, but in vain ; and it was recognised at home that, having committed that power to the local Government, it was impossible to interfere with that power. The same thing had occurred with reference to New Zealand over and over again ; and with reference to Queensland the discussions were well known which took place on the question of the Kanaka traffic. It was felt that the proposals to renew that traffic were full of danger, but it was impossible for the Government at home to exercise any influence by way of recommending that a veto should be placed on any legislation of that kind, because it lay in the sphere of the business committed to the Colonial Government. How, then, could the veto be carried into effect by any attempt his country made to use it ? "

Happily for the Empire, however, all the tendencies on the part of our Colonies are towards greater union with the parent

country, and not towards separation. If the Colonies, which are so remote, and whose separation would affect us so much less than that of Ireland, are desirous of drawing closer to England, how inauspicious a time to inaugurate separation for Ireland, and to begin the dismemberment of the Empire! Mr. Goschen's words upon this false Colonial analogy are well worth quotation :—

"Remembering that the agrarian difficulty plays some part in this matter, we must consider that in the colonies there is boundless land, with none of those difficulties which have overtaxed our statesmen ; but the new colony of Ireland—if it is to be a colony—will find itself confronted with totally different difficulties from any with which our colonial Empire has to deal. So far as regards the position of Ireland itself; but as regards England, I wish the House to remember in all the debates on this Bill that our interests, English, Scotch, and Irish, are all interlaced in a manner totally different from any connection with the colonies. Look at the number of Irishmen who come over as labourers and in many other capacities to England. Look at the number of English who go to Ireland. Look at the English capital which flows to Ireland. Look at the assistance which is rendered to England's food supplies by Ireland. The interests are so interlaced that when you come to your finance you will often find it a difficult thing to say whether the income to be taxed is English or Irish income. I wish it to be shown, not only that this offer is a generous offer, but that it is workable, and that it will not lead to an infliction so intolerable that it might afterwards either land us in civil war or in subjugation."

FORMER IRISH ASSEMBLIES.

Mr. Gladstone, in 1886, cited the eighteenth century as in a pre-eminent sense "the century of Empire, in which Empire was enormously enlarged, trade was established, and the British Navy brought to supremacy, when England and Ireland had separate Parliaments." But Mr. Gladstone suppressed the all-important fact that the Irish Parliaments before 1782 were Parliaments of the English pale. Protestant Parliaments, and Parliaments under the control of the British land-owning class.

Moreover, *these former Irish Parliaments, thus composed and irregularly summoned, could originate no measure nor pass any Bill which had not been previously approved by the Viceroy and the Irish Privy Council, and also by the King and by the English Privy Council.* Grattan's Parliament in 1782 was freed from these restrictions, and forthwith Ireland entered upon a disastrous course of political and commercial decline and social disorder. This culminated in the rebellion of 1798, and rendered the Union necessary. Grattan's Parliament was notorious for its venality, wastefulness, and internal dissensions. To quote the opinion of the *Sheffield Telegraph* :—

"Grattan's Parliament had wearied nearly all classes of Irishmen, except the small class in Dublin who benefited by its extravagance. Mr. Pitt saw that it was an evil to be improved off the face of the earth. Observation and experience had convinced him that the existence of two Parliaments under one Sovereign was undesirable. Differences of race and faith, opposing prejudices, conflicting aspirations, and irreconcilable ambitions, made it necessary to have but one Legislature. He saw a great danger looming in the distance, and he thus expressed himself :—

. . . . "'Will any man tell me when we come to treat of peace, for instance, or to consider any subject of alliance with any foreign Power, or upon any question of trade or commerce, that then the local prejudices—I say prejudices, for they have great influence—*may not occasion a difference between the Legislatures upon points that may be essential to the welfare of the British Empire.* No matter what the cause of difference may be, it is enough that there may be such a difference.'"

Ample proofs of the decadence of Ireland under the only real separate legislature it ever possessed will be found on a later page. Mr. Gladstone also forgets that the French sent an army to assist the Irish rebels. But for our maritime ascendency in those days and contrary winds, before steam and telegraphs had annihilated distance, General Hoche's force might have caused Great Britain the greatest danger. If a Parnellite Parliament were allowed to organise and to arm the Irish people, a rebellion at the close of the nineteenth century would cost Great Britain twenty times the sacrifice of blood and treasure that the Irish rebellion of 1798 involved. But it might be with truth retorted to Mr. Gladstone's citation of the example of the eighteenth century that, in those days, the destinies of England and the Empire were guided by statesmen who had the wisdom to rule and by ministers who had the courage to govern. The great men who in the eighteenth century directed the power of this country and built up its empire said what they meant and did what they said. They never shrank from treating the foes of England as enemies to be vanquished, or from repressing lawbreakers and subduing rebels. The result was, as Mr Gladstone confessed, in 1886, that the eighteenth century was the century of Imperial enlargement, of the establishment of trade and of our naval supremacy. Had Mr. Gladstone then been Prime Minister, England, instead of becoming the centre of the greatest and wealthiest dominion that the world has ever seen, would have sunk to the level of Holland or of Spain.

GOOD PRECEDENTS TO FOLLOW.

Against these inapplicable and unhappy precedents, which really constitute warning beacons to guard Englishmen from their fatal course, rather than precedents to follow, the conspicuous instances of Germany, Italy, and the United States at once occur. These are the leading, the progressive, the prosperous, and powerful nations of the world. Germany, Italy, and the United States owe their success and their present grandeur to the principle of unification, as opposed to that of disruption They have become great and strong by taking a course the exact opposite of that urged upon this country by Mr. Gladstone.

There are three great nations, and three only, that have made vast strides forward during one generation in national strength and in general progress. These are Italy, Germany, and the United States. Each and all of those States has become strong and great because it has reversed and overthrown a Separatist policy and has adopted a policy of Union. Italy thirty-three years ago was a helpless congeries of different States and legislatures, "a mere geographical expression." Italy established, instead, one Monarchy, with one army and navy, and one Imperial Parliament; and Italy forthwith became a great nation and a first-class European Power. Germany had been for centuries, owing to her divisions, the prey of her enemies on East and West and South. Germany, twenty-three years ago, established an Imperial Parliament under one Emperor, with one German army and navy; and Germany is, in consequence, strong and secure, the greatest military power in the world, and the Arbiter of Europe. It is true that German unity is not yet complete and absolute, as there are still some subordinate legislatures. But the supremacy of the Imperial Reichstag is unquestioned. The movement in Germany has been entirely towards unity, and it is likely to continue.

Last, and perhaps chiefest of all, thirty years ago the Democratic Republic of the United States was threatened with separation. One-third of the American people, not one-thirteenth, as in Ireland, wished to separate from the Union. The majority determined to preserve their unity, and for five years they carried on a terrible civil war in order to prevent separation. Union triumphed in the end, and since then the prosperity and progress of the United States have been almost boundless. A feeble attempt is sometimes made to compare the State Legislatures in America with a separate Irish Parliament. There are over fifty State Legislatures, and their position far more resembles that of English County Councils than a separate Irish Parliament. On the broad ground of principle, and from the lessons of history, there is nothing to be said for the Separatist policy.

The British people will do well to copy the splendid example of German, Italian, and American union rather than that of Turkish disintegration and decay, or of Austrian embarrassment and weakness.

FIVE PRINCIPAL OBJECTIONS TO A SEPARATE PARLIAMENT FOR IRELAND.

The main objections to Mr. Gladstone's "Home Rule" may be summed up under five heads :—

I.—REPEAL OF THE UNION.

That it means repeal of the Union, i.e., separation between England and Ireland, and weakening of our Imperial power. Repeal of the Union will constitute the worst possible precedent for the future, it is a long step towards the disintegration of the British Empire, and it will lead to woes unnumbered for Ireland as well as for Great Britain. The creation of a separate Irish Parliament would be, in fact, a direct reversal of all that makes nations strong and great.

Vide pp 23 & 88.

II.—NO FINALITY.

That there would be no finality in Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule scheme. It would completely derange and upset all the existing relations between the two countries, and the entire fabric of Irish government. And it would put nothing satisfactory or stable in their place. Total separation between the two countries would be infinitely preferable to the arrangement under Mr. Gladstone's proposals. Ireland would then be a foreign country, and we should know exactly what to expect from her, and how to deal with her. The Irish would have an opportunity of working out their own salvation, or more probably their own ruin, absolutely without interference, and without the power of blaming England or "British misrule" for their failure. The "Home Rule" scheme would produce all the disadvantages of a foreign state without any clearness or simplification in the relations between the two countries. There are infinite sources of dispute, quarrel, and war established in the most blind and wanton way throughout Mr. Gladstone's proposals of 1893, just as in his Bill of 1886. The withdrawal of the army, the navy, the coinage, the constabulary, law-making as to navigation and external trade, and control over the customs, and the right of dealing with questions of religious education and religious establishment from the Irish Parliament and the Irish people would constitute a multitudinous variety of grievances which would be the basis of constant ill-blood and agitation. The financial arrangements and the power of veto, which Mr. Gladstone proposes, have already been denounced by the Nationalist leaders as not sufficiently favourable to Ireland. One by one the removal of every disability would be clamoured for and exacted by the Irish. This would go on until the Irish succeeded in making their legislature absolutely sovereign and separation complete, or else in provoking Great Britain into a war of resistance to their inexorable demands.

Vide pp. 36 to 38, and 89.

III.—UNFAIR TO THE BRITISH TAXPAYER.

That Mr. Gladstone's scheme is most unfair to the people of England and Scotland, and especially to the tax-payers of the two

Vide pp. 97 to 102

countries. Mr. Gladstone confessed in 1886 that, in order to win over the consent of the Irish party to their exclusion from Westminster, he had made Ireland, in his Irish Government Bill, a present of £1 400,000 per year, and that he had reduced the proportion of the Irish contribution to Imperial expenditure from 1-14th to 1-26th. Besides this, then Mr. Gladstone proposed, in his Land Purchase Bill, to throw upon the British Taxpayers, without any safeguards, a responsibility for £50,000,000 at the least, and ultimately for £150,000,000. His present scheme is hardly less unfair to Great Britain. It lowers the Irish share in Imperial Expenditure from 1-14th to 1-25th. It gives Ireland a surplus of £500,000—that is, a "war indemnity"—at the expense of the British taxpayer. It gives the Irish the right of dealing with their own taxes. Yet it removes the Irish estimates from all control of the Imperial Parliament, while at the same time it places that Parliament and the Imperial Ministry at the mercy of the 80 Irish members that are to be retained.

IV.—COMPLICATIONS WITH FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

Vide pp. 102 to 106.

That the most serious and menacing complications would arise with the great Irish population in the United States and with the Government of that country, and also with other Foreign Governments, if a separate legislature were granted to Ireland.

V.—RUIN TO IRELAND—ULSTER.

Vide pp. 32—33, and 107 to 113.

That a separate Irish Parliament would be the ruin of Ireland. It would either cause civil war between the Loyalists and the Nationalist Separatists, or would necessitate the coercion of loyal and Protestant Ulster by British troops acting on behalf of the Nationalists. This the British people would never endure. The loyalists of Ireland have suffered because of their fidelity to the British Crown and to the British connection. Ulster is the centre and backbone of all that is progressive and prosperous in Ireland. The people of England and Scotland would never submit that their brethren in blood, in religion, and in loyalty should be forced by British bayonets into submission to the demoralising and oppressive yoke of the Nationalist factions and of Archbishop Walsh. Moreover, a separate legislature would prove the ruin of the Celtic majority of Ireland. Grattan's Parliament in the last century was a pitiable failure. A Nationalist Parliament would be a still more disastrous experiment. It would mean the absolute supremacy of the National League and of the band of conspirators, outrage mongers, and atrocious criminals by whom its power is enforced. It would mean the handing over of the government of Ireland to the dynamitards and assassins who, from across the Atlantic, so

largely controlled and supported the National League and its leaders in Ireland.

THE NATIONAL LEAGUE SUPREME.

The establishment of a separate legislature in Dublin would mean simply the legalising of the despotism of the National League and of the village tyrants through whom it worked. The National League was from 1880 to 1887 over two-thirds of Ireland, practically supreme. Its agents were only restrained from wholesale plunder, and in many cases from outrage and murder, by the existence of the police and by the dread of the British Army. The organisation by which its power was maintained was similar to that of the Jacobin clubs which terrorised France in 1793. The bulk of the people were helpless before small cliques of organised ruffians, who maintained universal intimidation by a carefully manipulated system of boycotting and lawless outrage. Until the power of this brutal society was broken, and the power of the law reasserted, self-government would have meant absolute ruin to every loyal, honest, and true man in at least three-fourths of Ireland.

I do not wish to say anything unkind, still less anything unfair, of the Irish race. They have many interesting, brilliant, and attractive qualities. Socially there is no people more agreeable. They are generous, warm hearted, brave and hospitable. It would be a great pity, and a serious loss to Parliament, if all the Irish members were removed from St Stephen's; though perhaps their numbers might with advantage be reduced. But with all these fine and attractive qualities there are two prominent qualities in which the Irish Celt is deficient—order and industry. It is a mistake to suppose that this deficiency is confined to the Irish in Ireland. *Cæteris paribus*, that is allowing for the different conditions and advantages of life in the United States and in Australia, the want of these qualities is just as noticeable in those countries as in Ireland. Whatever may be the cause—race, or history, or religion, or probably a mixture of all three—the *Celtic Irishman generally kicks against the law, and is often fonder of leisure than of work.* For this reason, it is of immense value to the Irish people and to social order that they should be mixed with, and under the influence of, races wanting their own gay vivacity, but steadier, more law-abiding, and industrious. The Irish might possibly in time evolve, after much struggle and suffering, a settled Government. But their interests are inextricably bound up with those of Great Britain. The experiment is needless and rash, and would do great harm to all three kingdoms and to the empire. It is childish to assume that all races have the same governing capacity and the same qualities. The North German

is as different from the Neapolitan as the frigid from the torrid zone.

The Irish Celts have not in any part of the world shown much aptitude for self-government or for constitutional progress. Mr. Gladstone has only been able to quote two instances in favour of his thesis of the suitability of the Celtic Irish for an independent Parliament. These were, oddly enough, the Irish soldiers in the British Army and the Royal Irish Constabulary. But both these examples tell against his theory. The Irish soldiers and the Irish constabulary are admirable forces, but both have been trained and disciplined under British law and British leadership. This guidance in order and discipline is precisely what the Celtic race needs. It is only when acting under the beneficent influence and control of British order and civilisation that they have ever been peaceful and prosperous. Under the separate legislature which is known as Grattan's Parliament, Ireland steadily retrograded both in social order and in commercial prosperity. Since the Union, and in consequence of it, Ireland has enormously progressed in material wealth and general comfort, as will be clearly demonstrated later.

I.—REPEAL OF THE UNION.

Vide pp. 23,24 & 85. In spite of Mr. Gladstone's assertion to the contrary, his Bill of 1886 bore within itself the principle of Repeal, and the ultimate result of that or of any similar measure must be, unless checked by force, total separation. The essence of the Act of Union of 1800, which begun by saying that "The Kingdoms of Great "Britian and Ireland shall be united into one kingdom by the "name of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland," lies in the third and chief article of the Union. This states "that "the said United Kingdom shall be represented in one and the "same Parliament, to be called the Parliament of the United "Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland." Mr. Gladstone's Bill of 1886 removed the Irish representatives from this united Parliament, and it deprived them of all voice or share in the control of Imperial affairs. On the other hand, it created a separate Irish Parliament for domestic affairs, and it forbade the Imperial Parliament to make laws for Ireland except on certain questions. Could such a change involve anything less than the repeal of the Union? The Irish Parliament was to have no right of interference or authority in any *foreign, colonial* or *Indian subject*, or in any questions connected with the succession to the *Crown*, with the *Customs*, with the rights of the existing owners of land, with the *Irish Exchequer division*, with the army and *the militia*, and with *external trade and navigation*.

In all matters, however, not specially excepted, the new Irish legislature was to be supreme. The Imperial Parliament could not, under Mr. Gladstone's Bill of 1886, interfere to prevent Mr. Parnell and his followers from depriving the Loyalists of Ulster of the ordinary rights of citizens—from abolishing trial by jury, or suspending the Habeas Corpus. The principle of Separation is bad enough, but the certain consequences of Mr. Gladstone's proposals are worse. They would place, beyond a doubt, an enormous leverage in the hands of those who are bent upon separation, and would lead to a complete estrangement and separation between the two countries at no distant date. It was clear in 1886 that the Nationalist members only accepted the Home Rule Bill as an instalment, and as the means of getting total repeal and separation. Mr. Michael Davitt confessed this with much frankness when he said in 1886:—

"I have been asked whether Irishmen will be satisfied with these arrangements, and whether they will accept them as a permanent settlement of the question. I say that it is *as unreasonable as to ask me, after I have had my breakfast, to refrain from demanding my dinner and my supper.*"

Mr. Gladstone then taught the Irish people to look upon themselves as "foreigners," and British laws as "foreign." The Bill of 1893 not only puts great restrictions upon the sphere of the Irish Parliament, and thereby sows the seed of future discontent, but it also creates, in the 80 Irish representatives to the Imperial Parliament, a machinery, capable of development in the adroit hand of the Irish agitator. How long will the impulsive Irish race submit to the numberless restrictions which both the Bills of 1886 and 1893 imposed, or any other scheme for a subordinate Irish Parliament, must impose upon an Irish Legislature.

II.—NO FINALITY IN MR. GLADSTONE'S NEW LEGISLATURE.

The chief objection to a "Home Rule" scheme is that it would unsettle everything and settle nothing. It would be a great and alarming change in the constitution and government of these realms. Yet there could be no finality or pretence of finality about it. Mr. Gladstone's scheme is full of inconsistencies and paradoxes, and it literally bristles with materials for differences and disputes of the most aggravated kind. The three kingdoms and the Empire have been governed by one united Imperial Parliament, which, with the Sovereign, forms the supreme legislative and executive authority and power over all British territory and British subjects. It is proposed to create a separate Parliament for Ireland, with 80 representatives in the Imperial Parliament to sit at Westminster. This

Vide pp. 36 to 38, and 85.

Irish assembly is to have sole control over the internal administration of Ireland, with some very important exceptions. The collection of the Customs is refused to the Irish, and left to the Imperial Parliament. The right of endowing any religious body is denied to the Irish Parliament. The control of any military force is also refused to them. The Irish Parliament is not to have the smallest right of interference with, or control over, the foreign or colonial relations of the British Empire Yet they are to pay a yearly contribution of £2,370,000 towards Imperial expenses.

Now, is it likely that any people who have gained a separate legislature would have been, or would be, content with such exceedingly limited and mutilated powers as those which Mr. Gladstone offers to Ireland? The Irish Celts are probably the most exacting, pushing and aggresive race that the world contains. Their incessant and never satisfied demands from the British Parliament might surely convince the most shortsighted of British representatives as to their character. How long is it probable that the Irish people, or the Nationalist leaders and their followers, who would dominate an Irish Parliament, or the fiercer Irish-American revolutionists, who have thus far supported and controlled the Nationalist party, would be satisfied to maintain the restrictions which Mr. Gladstone's scheme imposes. How long would they consent to pay £2,370,000 to the Imperial exchequer, which will inevitably be described as a British tribute and a stamp of inferiority? Everyone of these restrictions would be denounced, resisted, and its removal fiercely demanded of the Imperial Parliament. They could only be maintained by force—that is, by war. Every year that passed after the establishment of a separate Irish Parliament would make the enforcement of any terms of subordination more and more difficult, if not impossible.

SEPARATION OR CIVIL WAR.

Any proposals of "Home Rule" mean one of two things—separation, or else war, sooner or later, to prevent separation. How long is it possible that a people so sensitive, excitable, and demanding as the Irish, would submit to marked inferiority? Indeed, it is evident that such a scheme as that of 1886 would never have been accepted by Mr. Parnell, or any of the Irish Nationalist leaders, but for their conviction that it would constitute a direct and potent lever towards the absolute separation which they have over and over again announced as their ultimate aim.

Mr. Parnell himself proclaimed in 1880 that—

"None of us, whether we are in America or in Ireland, or wherever we may be, will be satisfied until we have destroyed the last link which keeps Ireland bound to England."

Mr. Brennan, the Secretary of the Land League, and one of the most powerful in the band of Irish-American conspirators, said:—

"I ask you to keep before your minds the one ultimate object—the sovereign independence of your country. It is the duty of every man to work to make Ireland a nation. I mean no mockery of freedom. I mean Ireland mistress of her own destinies—Ireland with a national army to guard her shores, Ireland with a national senate, and Ireland with a national Government that will know no higher authority than the sovereign will of the Irish people."

Mr. William O'Brien, said at Gorey on August 23rd, 1885:—

"When the complete programme of the Land League is accomplished, the soil of Ireland would be free, its people owning no master but the Almighty, and *owning no flag but the green flag of an independent Irish Nation.*"

These declarations could be matched from the speeches of almost every prominent Nationalist in and out of Parliament.

Under the head of "No English Veto" the objections of many leading Irish Nationalists to the Imperial veto have already been given.

The history of the world affords no instance of an independent legislature remaining satisfied without power over the very points which Mr. Gladstone proposed to deny to the new Irish Parliament.

THE DANGER FROM AN INDEPENDENT IRELAND.

Ireland is now comparatively powerless to injure the interests of Great Britain or of the British Empire. Ireland has been discontented; not of late years with good cause, but simply on account of the licence which the feebleness of Mr. Gladstone's Ministry from 1880 to 1882 conceded to a seditious press and platform, and to an organised terrorism. But there can be no serious power for injury to England or to the Empire in Irish antagonism as Ireland now is. Our present garrison, even the gallant Ulstermen of the North alone, if given a free hand, would suffice to maintain the Queen's authority in Ireland. vide pp. 21–22.

But supposing Great Britain were to concede to the Irish Parliament all the Nationalist demands—police, judges, army, taxes—what would be the inevitable result? Mr. Parnell has himself told us. The judges and police might become the instruments of injustice and spoliation. Mr. Parnell said at Wicklow, on October 5th, 1885:—

"I claim this for Ireland—that if the Irish Government of the future considers that there are *certain industries in Ireland which would be benefited by protection* and which could be nursed by protection, and which could be placed in such a position as to enable them to compete with similar industries in other countries by a course of protection extending over a few years, *the Irish Parliament ought to have power to carry out that policy.*"

This claim is prohibited by the present Bill. Bounties are not prohibited; but how long will a separate Irish Parliament observe such a restriction? The creation of a separate Irish army is a far greater danger. The Irish are excitable, passionate and martial. If organised and disciplined they make useful and formidable soldiers. Give them an Irish Parliament, and that valour which has hitherto been of service in building up and consolidating our common Empire and our united prosperity, would in the future be used against our Imperial interests, and in support of the enemies of this country and of the enemies of the best interests of Ireland.

Once give Ireland a separate Legislature with control of the police, the administration, and the army, and we deliberately establish within sixty miles of our western shores, within a few hours' steaming of our most populous and important seaports, an organised, armed, and well prepared enemy which may inflict upon us grave, perhaps irreparable, injury. What would it mean to England, to the working classes, to the nation at large, if an Irish army of 100,000 fighting men were planted within a few score miles of Liverpool, Glasgow, and Bristol.

As Mr. Balfour well put it in his speech at Ealing on March 9th, 1893:—

"I can prove that, whether the Bill be or be not a Bill for the better government of Ireland, it is unquestionably and beyond all doubt a Bill for the worse government of Great Britain. (Cheers.) And I shall show you briefly, but conclusively, that in the great interests which Englishmen and Scotchmen, as Englishmen and Scotchmen, have at heart—namely, our interests in matters of national defence, in the smooth working of our institutions, and in other matters—this Bill is absolutely ruinous and destructive. (Hear, hear.) On the first of these themes I shall not detain you long, but I want to remind you of a well-known episode in the history of Ireland which occurred when Ireland had a Parliament of her own. At that time England was at war with all, or almost all, of the great nations of the world; she was struggling in every quarter of the globe against overwhelming odds. The Irish Parliament, feeling, and feeling with perfect truth, that it had not all the privileges which an independent Legislature had a right to demand if it were to be independent, used that moment, by the help of the Volunteer force in Ireland, to exact from Great Britain a change in the Irish Constitution which gave Ireland a practically sovereign legislature, free from every possible restriction on the part of the English Parliament. There is a lesson to be drawn from that fact in Irish history which may well give English politicians pause. (Cheers.) True it is that there is a clause in the Bill by which the Irish Parliament is not permitted to raise a military force; but *the Irish Parliament is permitted, as far as I can see, to raise a police force of unlimited numbers, disciplined if you please in military fashion*, and taking their orders from the central Government of Ireland. There is, moreover, nothing in the Bill that can by possibility

prevent any number of Irishmen, under any name, drilling themselves so as to prepare for any eventuality which the necessarily chequered history of a great Empire may bring forth. (Hear, hear.) I have heard it said that under the existing system Ireland requires 30,000 regular troops to keep her in submission, that being the number of troops actually quartered in that country. With my experience in Ireland, I tell you that a more idiotic and senseless proposition was never stated. (Hear, hear.) Were I responsible for the government of Ireland, I would guarantee to preserve that country from anything in the nature of organised outbreak without the assistance of a single regiment more than is required for an equal population in England and Scotland. (Hear, hear.) There are 30,000 troops in Ireland, no doubt, because there is accommodation for that number of troops there, and because for very obvious commercial reasons the Irish are unwilling that the custom which 30,000 troops bring them should be taken away; but under the existing system, as long as the Union is preserved, the presence of 30,000 troops is no more required in Ireland than that of 300,000 or 3,000,000 of them are. (Hear, hear.) But if you give Home Rule to Ireland you place it in the power of an Irish Government to make demands upon the Imperial Legislature which that Legislature may be most reluctant to grant, and *we may see forces raised in Ireland under the name of police or of some other name which may require you to keep your 30,000 troops in Ireland*, and may so cause you to lock up that amount of the national forces in that country instead of their being available for duty in other parts of the world. (Hear, hear.)"

NO PRACTICAL CHECK ON AN IRISH LEGISLATURE.

An Irish Volunteer force is not expressly forbidden by the present Bill. The immense difficulty of preventing the Irish Legislature from setting up this organised and armed force was well demonstrated by Sir James Stephen in the *Times* of May 1st, 1886:—

"The essential conditions of any plan that Parliament can be asked or could be expected to entertain are, in my opinion, these:—The unity of the Empire must not be placed in jeopardy. As Lord Hartington showed, it is not quite clear what Mr. Gladstone meant by the 'unity of the Empire.' The word 'unity' and the word 'Empire' are both susceptible of different meanings, and the meaning of the phrase must depend upon the meaning attached to each word. Whatever the meaning of the phrase may be, there is one thing which no ingenuity can deny to be inconsistent with the unity of the Empire in any and every sense of the words. This is the erection of Ireland into an independent nation, and I say that the Government of Ireland Bill places in jeopardy the unity of the Empire, because, if enacted into law, it would put it into the power of the persons who by statute would take the leading part in the Legislative Body to bring about the independence of Ireland if they are so minded. And because there is every reason to believe that they were so minded. It cannot, surely, be denied in good faith that the most prominent members and the most vigorous organs in the Press of the Irish Nationalist party, both in this country and in America, have repeatedly declared it to be their earnest wish to separate the last link which connects Ireland with England. If the fact is so, it is something like madness to legislate as if the fact were otherwise.

"Suppose, then, that the fact were that a majority of the Irish Legislative Body wished to erect Ireland into an independent nation, what would the Government of Ireland Act enable it to do? I could give any number of illustrations of things which it might do which would have that result. I will mention only one thing. Suppose it were to begin by passing a series of *resolutions*, asserting that *Ireland was, and always had had a right to be an independent nation;* that the *Act of Union was void*, having been procured by corruption; that the *Legislative Body claimed to be the Parliament of Ireland*, not under the restrictions of the Government Act, but by reason of the free choice of the Irish people. How could this

be dealt with? Such resolutions would not be an Act of Parliament and could not be vetoed, nor would there be the least use in vetoing them if they were accepted, as they no doubt would be, with enthusiasm by the great majority of Irish voters. They could not be prevented from standing on record, and so long as they did so stand they would constitute a solemn protest which would form in the eyes of their supporters a complete moral justification for any passive resistance whatever to English law, or for any active resistance if the opportunity arose. *How long would the Customs duties be collected?* How long would the State authority collect arrears from the new tenant proprietors after such a declaration?

"Suppose, again, that by a similar declaration or resolution the Legislative Body were to state their opinion that it was an *inherent right of the Irish people to form Volunteer associations.* This would not be 'making a law relating to the Volunteers,' and so would not fall under Section 3 of the Act, but it *would give the Irish Legislative Body an armed force* on which it might rely as much as if it were recognised by law. With such a force at its command, might not the Legislative Body at any time when the occasion arose legislate in direct defiance of the Government of Ireland Act and defy the Lord Lieutenant's veto? In short, the great and unanswerable argument to show that the scheme 'puts in jeopardy the unity of the Empire' is that it institutes a body which easily might, if so minded, make the continuance of any connection between England and Ireland impossible, and convert it during its continuance into a source of humiliation, misery, and scandal.

"If *the Irish Legislative Body* comes into existence and sets itself to obtain the independence of Ireland, by a careful use of its legal powers it will have the law on its side,—at the very least it *will have on its side a plausible claim to and a colour of legality*—and this would increase a thousandfold the legal and moral difficulty of opposing any kind of coercion, especially military coercion, to the defeat of any efforts made to effect separation. These difficulties are great enough as it is. As matters now stand, troops can hardly act in Ireland even against what is undoubtedly and avowedly criminal. Of what use would they be when they were called out to prevent conduct which the Irish Legislative Body declared to be legal, and when their actions would render them liable to be tried in courts presided over by judges responsible to the Irish Legislative Body, and by juries who would be as keen to convict them as they are at present to acquit persons accused of crimes another kind?

"*In the next place, how would the troops be set in motion?* No military officer would act on his own responsibility. The Irish magistrates, answerable to the Irish Legislative Body, would not call upon the troops to act against the orders of that body, though they might be compelled to act in obedience to it. Pass the Government Bill as it stands, and, as far as I can see, the only service on which British troops are ever likely to be employed in Ireland in a legal constitutional way would be in the suppression of any resistance which the Legislative Body might provoke on the part of the minority in Ulster and elsewhere."

In 1883 and 1884 Mr. Gladstone's blundering brought us to loggerheads with the French Republic; and at any time, we might be forced into a struggle with our great rival in Egypt and the Mediterranean. In April and May, 1885, Mr. Gladstone's blindness and long-continued surrender made a war with Russia for the safety of India not merely possible but most imminent. Let Englishmen consider as practical men, in either of these terrible contingencies—which indeed may recur again, when Mr. Gladstone is in power, at almost any moment—what it would mean to our Imperial position and to our very existence as

a free people to have a hostile army of 100,000 Irish men on our flank. It is not yet a hundred years since a French army landed in Bantry Bay. Had they been joined by 100,000 trained Irish soldiers the result might have been very different. The danger is most real. It is a peril which may not only weaken our power, multiply our taxes, and destroy our peace, but which may break up our Empire and overthrow our national independence. These are the conditions under which the Irish American agitators in Ireland would in future be encouraged and virtually invited to attack Great Britain. It needs no elaboration of detail to point out what a grave peril for this country is prepared by Mr. Gladstone's proposals.

"THE LINK OF THE CROWN."

It is said that there will be the link of the Crown, and that the Irish, with a separate Legislature, will become loyal and faithful subjects of the Queen. Before we put this vast power for evil into their hands it would be well to receive some signs of the loyalty which is at this twelfth hour so glibly promised. The Queen's name has never been mentioned at Nationalist gatherings; or, if it has been mentioned, it was greeted with shameful insults and disloyal demonstrations. Every emblem of the Queen's sovereignty and of Imperial union has been tabooed and affronted by those who follow the various factions of the Nationalists. The money which has supported these Separatists in Ireland has come from the ultra-Republican Irish fanatics in the United States. These have no idea of recognising British rule or Monarchy in any shape or form. Their influence is, and would be, predominant, and it would certainly lead an independent Irish Parliament to separation. Of what practical value is this link of the Crown, or the Royal veto. It is never exercised in the Imperial Parliament. Could it be used to check the resolve of an Irish Parliament to establish Irish independence? But apart from this ever-present influence, would not the causes of contention between the two countries be incessant and endless? If the Irish are not quarrelsome, they are certainly disputatious and polemical.

Questions connected with *Imperial taxation*, with *trade and navigation*, with *tariffs* and *fiscal* policy, with *religion*, with the hundreds of thousands of *Irish* settled in England, with *Irish agitation in America*, with the Irish troops, with our *policy towards foreign States*, would constantly arise. In a word, the causes of antagonism would be infinite, and would be certain to develop just at the moment that we least desired them.

England, in addition to her other dangers and her foreign foes, will have created for herself an ever-present danger upon her left flank, that will either have to be guarded against or succumbed to. An armed Ireland can only be guarded against by a great increase of our own army, by a large increase of our navy, and consequently by an enormous increase of our taxation. This is the plain, obvious, inevitable result of giving to Ireland separate legislation of any kind. If the British people allow Mr. Gladstone to make this last and most fatal sacrifice, it can only be said of them that they have lost the qualities that have made them great, and have forfeited the right to Empire.

REAL OBJECTS OF THE NATIONALIST PARTY.

The Duke of Argyll has stated, with the utmost plainness, the real objects of the Irish authors of this Separatist policy.

"Why is it that the Parnellite party demand a separate Parliament for Ireland? What is their object? Can it be said with truth that the Imperial Parliament of late years has been unwilling to listen to the grievances of Irishmen? ("No.") Have we not been spending our days and nights, sacrificing the interests of every other part of the country, to consider in the most benevolent spirit the grievances, real or supposed, of the Irish people? Have we not dismissed political economy and common sense to Jupiter and Saturn? In the very last session of Parliament we advanced a credit of five millions of money to enable the smaller farmers of Ireland to buy their farms at a rate which would impose on them no sacrifice whatever. Can it be said with truth that the Imperial Parliament is not at this moment willing to give everything to Ireland except the abolition of the Ten Commandments? (Laughter and cheers.) Now I want to push this question home. Why do the Parnellites want a separate Parliament? I will tell you why. Because they want to do in Dublin what they know that no civilised Legislature in the world would do—abolish the Decalogue and take possession of the property of other men. (Cheers.) Now I ask you who is it that has preached this doctrine to us? Who is the leader *who has impressed this upon us as the aim and object of the Parnellite party*? I will tell you who it is—it is Mr. Gladstone. Yet Mr. Gladstone used these words in a speech at Leeds on October 8th, 1881: 'For 'nearly the first time in the history of Christendom, a body, a small body of men 'have arisen, who are not ashamed to preach in Ireland the doctrine of public 'plunder. I make that charge advisedly in the situation which I hold (Prime 'Minister of the United Kingdom), and I shall ask you to judge whether it is not wrung from me by demonstrative evidence and by the hard necessity of the case.' Again, Mr. Gladstone said:—'It is individual liberty, and peculiarly that, that we 'are endeavouring to'—implying that it was the suppression of individual liberty that Mr. Parnell was attempting to effect. 'It is individual liberty, especially and 'peculiarly, that we are endeavouring to support. And why? Because the 'association which we are endeavouring to deal with has struggled hard to put 'down individual liberty.' He goes on to say: 'The immediate object which is 'proposed is rapine; I do no call it by any other name. Sometimes at party 'meetings in this country the words confiscation and spoliation are talked of until 'the words lose some of their force by repitition and by the sense that they are 'used in the spirit of exaggeration; but *this is sheer rapine*.' And listen to this concluding sentence: 'It is simply ruin for all who decline to obey the doctrine of 'the Land League.'"

III.—INJUSTICE TO THE BRITISH TAXPAYER.

The subject of the financial difficulties that must arise under Mr. Gladstone's "Home Rule" Bill of 1893 have been referred to at some length under the head of "*Equitable Repartition of Imperial Charges*" on p.p. 25 to 32. Mr. Arthur Balfour, in his speech at Ealing on March 8th, 1893, dealt in very able manner with these difficulties. The following are extracts from that speech:—

"The peculiarity of the new state of things which the Home Rule Bill sets up is this—that, while by the testimony of the Irish members themselves it is likely to produce bankruptcy in Ireland, it must undoubtedly inflict a very great financial wrong and hardship on England and Scotland. *Its injury is double. It injures Ireland and it injures us;* it is a separation of partnership, by which both partners are injured, and of which both partners have a right to complain. (Cheers.) I do not mean to-night to touch the Irish case. It will be sufficient if I say that Ireland under the Bill can only remain solvent so long as she is drunk. (Laughter.) Irish sobriety would be followed by Irish bankruptcy with absolute certainty under the provisions of this measure (cheers), for her sole substantial resource is Excise, and the Excise from which practically the whole of the money is obtained is the duty on spirits. (Cheers.) Ireland, however, is not at present my business. I am going to explain what your interests and the interests of the English and Scottish taxpayers are in this matter. Vide pp. 25 to 32, and 85-86.

"THE COLLECTION OF TAXES.

"In the first place, *the collection of taxes will become hopelessly complicated.* No human being can tell what will be the state under this Bill—where any man's income-tax is to be levied. It is now a comparatively simple matter, though not always an easy matter. (Laughter.) Under this new Bill it will become a very complicated matter, and, as a matter of fact, almost impossible in many cases. But there is a far worse evil to which we shall be subjected by this measure than the mere complication which will be introduced in our whole system of collecting taxes; and that evil is, *we shall cease to be masters of our own system of taxation.* At the present moment it is open to any Chancellor of the Exchequer to come down and, if he thinks fit, to propose an increase in the income-tax or a decrease in the Customs duty, and to think only of the general bearings of such propositions upon the classes who are asked to contribute more to the national resources and of the general effects on trade which will follow from his propositions. But put yourselves for a moment in the position of the Chancellor of the Exchequer for the future. Under this Bill Irish Customs are to be handed over wholly to the Imperial Exchequer; Irish Excise remains entirely with the Irish Government. Therefore, you will see, the contribution of Ireland to the Imperial Exchequer depends wholly on the amount which is produced by the Customs duty. Supposing for general reasons it occurred to a Chancellor of the Exchequer at Westminster that either because he wanted to alter the incidence of taxation as between classes, or for any other reason he desired to alter the Customs duty—say, to lower it—what would be the result? The result would be that Ireland would cease to contribute even the inadequate amount she does now; so that the Chancellor of the Exchequer's problem would be complicated by this fact—he would not merely have to consider whether he desired to raise or to lower the Customs duty on spirits, or the Customs duty on tea or tobacco—he would also have to consider whether he could permit the Irish taxpayer to get off paying that share of the Imperial burdens which under this Bill Ireland is bound to pay. *Every Chancellor*

of the Exchequer from this time forth, therefore, so long as this Bill is allowed to exist, *would come to the consideration of questions of Imperial finance bound hand and foot.* Every step he takes will be hampered by the consideration that he is modifying in one direction or another the contribution which Ireland is bound to pay to our general Imperial expenditure. (Cheers.) Take one more case of the same kind. In moments of national emergency, when war is imminent or when war is going on, the first great instrument of taxation which the Chancellor of the Exchequer looks to is the income-tax. It is not the only one, but it is the great instrument in moments of national emergency. *If this Bill passes we shall have no power to put a single sixpence upon the Irish income-tax.* The Irish income-tax under this Bill goes to the Irish Exchequer, and if, therefore, the Imperial Government were at war, and if, because they were at war, they had to put a penny or twopence on the income-tax, it would mean, in order to carry out some important Imperial object in which Ireland was as much interested as England or Scotland, that they *would have to put a tax of which England and Scotland would have to pay not only their own share, but also the share of Ireland.* (Cheers.) Now, consider for a moment another question connected with taxation, or, rather, with the levying of taxation. It is rather more technical, but, believe me, it is not less important. You keep nominally the right to all the money which you get by Customs. How, let me ask, are you going to levy those Customs? It appears you are going to keep, under the Bill, Imperial Custom-house officers along the coast of Ireland to prevent the introduction of goods on which duty should be paid. *Ireland at this moment is the paradise of smugglers.* (Laughter.) What will it be, *what must it be, when the only people interested in preventing smuggling are officials who come to Ireland in a foreign garb* (cheers), in a foreign uniform, absolutely unsupported either by the public opinion of the country in which they are carrying out their duties or by any force which that country has at its disposal? What chance have they of doing their duty with effect? Their duty is hard, indeed, now; how do you think it will be carried out under the new system? I tell you it would not be carried out at all. (Cheers.) You trust, I suppose, to the loyalty of those men on whom you cast the duties, which, under the new circumstances, will be of tremendous difficulty. Do you think they are likely to look with confidence to the support of the British Government? They have before them the example of the Irish constabulary. They know how a loyal force in Ireland is treated by the Imperial Government. (Cheers.) They see before them a practical example of what the honour of English statesmen is worth; and, believe me, *they will find it more convenient and more lucrative not to trouble their heads too particularly about carrying out those onerous and unpopular duties;* and the amount you will get from your Irish customs will be a small fraction of that which ought to be paid on Irish imports. (Cheers.) But even that is not all. I do not suppose many of you are aware, but it is nevertheless the fact, that the duty of the Custom-house does not end, and cannot end, at the mere port of entry. If such articles as coffee, cocoa, and tobacco are brought in, and duty is paid upon them, an inspection is still necessary in order to see that when they are introduced into the country they are not adulterated and the duty is thereby not evaded. It has been found absolutely necessary, in order to maintain our revenue upon such articles as tobacco—one of the most elastic scources of revenue—to arm officers of the Government with the most tremendous powers of entering at all hours into the manufactories of tobacco and other places where adulteration may be practised in order to see that the tobacco is not dealt with in such a manner as to defraud the revenue. Will it be believed that in this Bill, as it stands, there is not the beginning or the scintilla of a proposition for dealing with this great practical financial difficulty? And it cannot be dealt with unless you sow broadcast over Ireland Imperial officials, not confined to the ports of entry, not confined to the coast, but with the right to enter into every Irish manufactory and the place of every Irish wholesale dealer to see whether those duty-paying goods might by any possibility be adulterated. I want to know, in the first place, how Ireland is going to tolerate the presence of

those officials if you appoint them ; and how you are going to collect your revenue if you do not appoint them ? (Cheers.) That is a practical question which for, many mysterious reasons, together with several other practical questions, has never suggested itself to the ingenious and able framers of this measure (laughter) but which any man acquainted with our system of finance knows to be of first-class importance. (Cheers.) There is one more point with regard to the collection of what is due to us, under the Bill, from Ireland. I do not know how many of you have read the Bill. But those who have must, I am sure, have been struck, and even amused, by a clause which enables the Lord Lieutenant, in cases where duties are due from the Irish Exchequer to the Imperial Exchequer, to declare that such payments shall be made, and that until they are made no other payments shall be legal. An excellent provision. But how is it going to be enforced ? The Lord Lieutenant under the new system will be, no doubt, a worthy and able nobleman, sitting in State in the Castle, but not having command of a single policeman, not being obeyed by a single official, not being able to require the services of a single instrument by which the behests of the Imperial Government are to be carried out. If he is defied, what is he going to do ? (Hear, hear.) There have been cases in which Lord Lieutenants have been defied. I very well recollect that under Lord Spencer's government in 1882, at a time when Lord Spencer was still a Unionist and still a supporter of law and order (cheers), *the corporation of Limerick were required by the tribunals of the country to pay a certain sum. The corporation of Limerick firmly but politely—by the way, I am not sure about politely (laughter)—refused to carry out the decrees of the Court.* The Government found that their only remedy was to imprison the whole of the corporation, and they shrank from such an extremity. The result was that the debt from the corporation of Limerick, though as good a debt as ever was contracted, has never been paid from that day to this. (Cheers.) Now, the Lord Lieutenant under the new Bill will not even have the power of putting into prison the Irish Administration (laughter), and I am utterly at a loss to understand how, if the Irish Administration act like the corporation of Limerick, this unfortunate representative of the Queen is to do anything but send piteous letters to the Home Government, saying that, though he has received their orders, he is perfectly unable to execute them. I venture to prophesy that the debts of the Irish Government to the Imperial Government are as little likely to be paid as the debts of the Irish tenants to the Irish landlords under the new system. (Cheers.)"

IRELAND'S QUOTA.

Equally good was Mr. Balfour upon the subject of Ireland's proper quota of contribution to Imperial charge.

"One more point in connection with this subject. I now want to discuss the amount of that quota, and to ask whether it is just. The principle on which the Irish members argue the amount which Ireland should pay to the Imperial Exchequer is two-fold. They take as their basis the amount which Ireland now pays, and they also consider the amount which it would be convenient to Ireland to pay. (Laughter.) I venture to say that as English and Scotch taxpayers we have nothing whatever to do with either one of these considerations or the other. *So long as Ireland is an integral part of the United Kingdom*, so long as one system of taxation and one system of government are prevalent over the three kingdoms, *then we need not inquire too curiously whether Ireland gains or does not gain by the transaction ;* and I for my part have never hesitated to go further, and to say that the rich partner might well bring its resources to the aid of the poor partner (hear, hear), and that we may gladly give more than our fair share in order to assist the impoverished population in the west of Ireland. *But very different principles must prevail if there is to be a dissolution of partnership.* (Cheers.) If Ireland is going her own way, with her own executive, her own Chancellor of the

Exchequer, and her own system of taxation, then we shall have to consider on what principle the liabilities of the two countries are to be determined. For my part, having considered this question to the best of my ability, I can only see three possible plans upon which Imperial burdens can be divided between Ireland and Great Britain. The first plan is based upon the relative wealth of the two countries. The second is based upon the relative population of the two countries. The third plan is based upon the two principles together. If any one can suggest a fourth plan I shall be obliged to him. I have not heard it (laughter), because I do not admit that the amount which Ireland actually has contributed in the past under a totally different system of government is any guide at all. *Under the plan of relative wealth Ireland would be paying, in round figures, somewhat more than £1,000,000 less than she ought to be paying*, and if you capitalize that sum it comes to *about £50,000,000 at 3 per cent.*, the rate always taken in Government transactions. If, on the other hand, you take population, Ireland, being somewhere about one-seventh of the population of the United Kingdom, ought to pay about one-seventh of the Imperial burdens; and in that case, under the Bill, *Ireland is paying over £6,000,000 less than she ought to be paying.* If you capitalize that sum *it comes to over £200,000,000.* Perhaps I shall be told that it is rather hard on Ireland, the poor country, to deal with her simply by population, and I admit that. But also I think it is true that you ought not to deal with her simply by wealth, because there are many advantages which Ireland gets from the Imperial connexion which have nothing whatever to do with the relative wealth of the two countries. Every Irishman will obtain, under the new system, the whole advantage of Imperial protection. He will obtain the whole advantage of being a citizen of the British Empire, of having his share in the government of India, and of having the English Civil Service open to him—in fact, of being able to take part in any transaction in Great Britain, not as an alien, but as a citizen of the Queen. And these advantages will belong to him, not in proportion as he is a rich man, but by the mere fact of his existence. These benefits should be estimated by population and not by wealth; and in as far as they are the whole advantages which he gets, the population basis is a sound one for the division of burdens. But I grant that there are other benefits which he obtains with regard to which the amount of wealth is a determining circumstance. You do not expect, for example, that the poor man shall pay as much for his insurance as the rich man pays; and it is fair enough that we, the wealthier country, should pay for the insurance of our wealth a greater sum per head than the Irish. Therefore, *clearly a fair system on grounds of broad equity is that the Irish contribution to Imperial sources should be calculated partly on population and partly on wealth, a system not unfamiliar in local government.* Then, combining these two principles, *Ireland will pay at least three millions too little under Mr. Gladstone's proposal. In other words, she is exacting a fine from the United Kingdom of about 100 millions sterling*, or the amount of the debt which we contracted in consequence of the Crimean war. (Cheers.) I do not know whether this general survey of the effects which Home Rule will have upon you, not as citizens of the British Empire, but as Englishmen and Scotchmen, is likely to recommend that measure to your approval. (Cheers.) To me it seems the net result is this—that because the Irish, the so-called Nationalist party, partly by favouring crime and partly by favouring obstruction (hear, hear), have made themselves formidable in the conflict in which they have engaged with the Imperial Government, and because those who now have under their control the Imperial Government appear to be of the opinion that they have been worsted in the fight—because they have now admitted themselves to be beaten, or, to use our old Eton phrase, "have taken a licking" (laughter) under terms which are absolutely ruinous to the citizens of this island (cheers)—*we are to pay 100 millions*, not for the purpose of getting rid of the Irish question, but *for the purpose of having the Irish question perennially with us.* (Cheers.) *We are called upon to pay 100 millions not to be master in our own house*, but to give up the control of our own affairs to those who have shown conclusively that they have no love of our interests. (Cheers.) *The Irish are to tell us by what administrations we are to be governed; the Irish are to control our taxation;*

the Irish are to manage our elections; and in order to remunerate them for this thankless task we are going gratuitously to hand over 100 millions of our money to their pockets. I am perfectly certain of this, that the British elector is not swayed solely by a sordid interest in his own personal concerns. I believe he is capable of more generous emotions. I believe that he will not abandon the minority in Ireland. (Loud cheers.) He will not sacrifice the supremacy of Parliament. He will not sacrifice the interests of the Empire. But if there be a man so mean of soul that these great interests do not appeal to him, then I say look to your own pockets (laughter); look to your own influence over the management of your own affairs, and you will see that this Bill deals a not less deadly blow at that which you, in your shortsighted selfishness, think are solely your own interests than it deals at those Irish Loyalists whose interests I am convinced will never long be absent from our minds. (Loud and prolonged cheers.)"

Mr. Gladstone proposed by his Home Rule Bill of 1886 to present £1,400,000 to the Irish people in his then division of the Imperial expenditure, but he offered them much more in reality than this. He lowered the proportion of Irish contribution from $\frac{1}{14}$th, which he said was the just proportion to $\frac{1}{26}$th. He now proposed to reduce it to one-twenty-fifth. The English and Scotch taxpayer would have, in future, contributed at the rate of £1 10s. 11d. a head, while the Irish taxpayers were only to be assessed at 13s. 5d. a head. In 1886 the proportion of total burdens was £2 10s. 11d. for each person for Great Britain, as against £1 7s. 10d. for Ireland, so that Mr. Gladstone reduced the proportion of taxes *a head* for the Irish people by nearly one-fourth or 25 per cent. Ireland was also to be freed from all share in extraordinary expenditure in the future, and her annual contribution to the Imperial Exchequer was to remain fixed at £3,242,000, no matter what the burdens might be that England and Scotland had to bear. A war might have been forced upon the Empire in defence of interests as vital to Ireland as they are to Great Britain.

Ireland would have shared the benefits of a successful struggle to the full, but she was to bear none of its charges. This excessive favour shown to revolutionary Ireland was over and above the very heavy responsibilities and burdens which *Mr. Gladstone's land purchase scheme* of 1886 would have placed upon the Imperial Exchequer. The creation of £50,000,000 of Consols at once, and the creation of at least £70,000,000 more in the near future, in order to enable Mr. Parnell's supporters among the Irish peasantry to own the land, was a tremendous additional price to pay for his Home Rule scheme. These were the open and avowed sacrifices imposed by Mr. Gladstone's plans.

Sir John Lubbock analysed the financial aspect of the Separatist Scheme in 1886. He said:—

"In the first place, as regards taxation, Ireland pays something like one-fifteenth of the Imperial taxation. It is proposed that she shall in future contribute one-twenty-sixth, or, in round numbers, half as much as at present, and that

the other half should fall on us. But that is not all. Unfortunately our naval and military expenditure tends to increase, and the whole additional amount will fall on us. Moreover, if we are engaged in any war, the whole expenditure will have to be borne by England and Scotland. Again, out of the whole National Debt of £712,000,000 it is proposed that Ireland shall be responsible for £48,000,000 only. The respective debts of Great Britain and Ireland were kept separate until 1817, when they were amalgamated. At that time the debt of Ireland was £121,000,000. Since then the general debt has been reduced from £900,000,000 to £712,000,000; so that the debt of Ireland is reduced in proportion from £120,000,000 to £100,000,000. But why should it be taken at £48,000,000 only? Why should we take on ourselves £50,000,000 of Irish debt? Moreover, we are to render ourselves liable to Irish landlords for £120,000,000. Indeed, it may be doubted whether this would be all the liability, for Mr. Gladstone, only two years ago, estimated the value of Irish land at from £300,000,000 to £400,000,000. Why should we incur this gigantic liability if we can trust the new Irish Parliament? But, though these proposals will throw increased and ever-increasing burdens on England and Scotland, which are heavily taxed enough already, they will not benefit Ireland; because any saving she may effect will be more than neutralised by the injury to her credit, her trade, and her manufactures, and the too well-grounded fear that autonomy would lead to civil war. But for the meanness of such a proposal I would strongly prefer separation to Home Rule."

England would be bound to take measures of precaution and defence; our army would have to be greatly increased; our military and naval expenditure doubled; constant watchfulness exercised; and our imperial power and credit in dealing with foreign foes would be proportionately weakened. Ireland and the Irish people are bound by a thousand ties to this country which it is impossible to sever by political interest, historical connection, social and commercial relations of the closest character. Over £50,000,000 of English money is invested in Ireland. What would be its value if Home Rule were granted? The mere rumour of Mr. Gladstone's inclination towards separation has caused a panic, and the shares of the Bank of Ireland have fallen heavily. Mortgages on Irish landed estates are being hastily called in, and it has become impossible to borrow money on Irish land since the introduction of the "Home Rule" Bill.

Vide p. 65

IV.—COMPLICATIONS WITH THE UNITED STATES.

There is one extremely grave aspect of this separate Irish legislature which seems to have escaped notice. It is the tremendous vista of complications and conflict that it opens up between this country and the United States of America. The Irish electoral power in the United States is very large and very carefully organised. It absolutely controls the government of

several of the largest American cities. It has turned many a presidential election, and it is a force which all American politicians have to deal with and are anxious to conciliate and win over. The Irish, both at home and abroad, have a special aptitude for political organization of the wirepulling and Caucus kind. They vote, not according to individual opinion, but in solid masses under the direction of leaders. They take, as if by instinct, to political conspiracy, and they show a pride in voting solid without regard to any other considerations than the bidding of their chiefs and victory. The way in which the Irish brigade in Parliament long obeyed Mr. Parnell, and the manner in which the Irish recorded their votes at the last two elections, moving in great masses under the direction of their priests and of the National League, are further proofs of the same tendency.

THE IRISH IN AMERICA.

But Irish politics in the United States afford the most remarkable evidence of this trait in the Irish character. The greatest city of America has been for years, so far as its government goes, practically an Irish Republic. The municipal control of New York City has long been in the hands of the Irish voters. These are drilled and disciplined to a perfection which is almost incredible. The result is that no local Bill or improvement can be carried without the consent of the leaders of the Irish electorate. These are not generally men of high education or political morals. The consideration required to gain the Irish vote is invariably a pecuniary one or its equivalent. The result is, as it must always be where electors decline to exercise individual judgment and vote as solid machines under dictation, that the grossest venality and corruption prevail. The municipal government of New York is, therefore, a mass of corruption, extravagance, and waste such as cannot be matched in modern, and probably not in ancient times. The same may be said of the other American cities, or portions of other cities where the administration is controlled by Irish vote.

In order to escape any possible imputation of unfairness or prejudice in dealing with this painful subject, is here quoted the account which Mr. Labouchere, an ardent apostle of Irish Home Rule, gave of a Municipal Scandal in New York. The following is from *Truth* of April 22nd, 1886:—

"A prettier gang of rascals than the New York Board of Aldermen could hardly be imagined. Their power for doing mischief, it is true, has from time to time been considerably curtailed by the citizens of New York, until only the right of granting franchises was left to them. These franchises applied to all kinds of affairs—such as street railways, signs, lamps, and even barbers' poles, not to forget ferries; and it is estimated that they are worth a million sterling, although yielding

to the city of New York only some £50,000. The balance appears to have gone into the pockets of the worthy Aldermen and a set of sharpers who lived upon carrying concessions through the State Legislature and Board of Aldermen. Of these, a man rejoicing in the significant name of Jacob, or Jake, Sharp appears to have been the ringleader. The game went on for years with impunity until a particularly bold stroke of business, the Broadway Railway Franchise, led to an exposure of the swindle. There were twenty-four members of the particular Board of Aldermen which sold this franchise, it is said, against a bribe to themselves of £100,000, and with a loss to the city of £180.000 a year. To their credit be it added that two of their number opposed the franchise, one of whom was Mr. Hugh Grant, since elected Sheriff of New York. Two others are dead, three have taken to their heels, and *seventeen have been incarcerated, and are awaiting their trial.* They will, it is to be hoped, be sentenced to such enforced seclusion as will afford them time for meditation as to the risk connected with granting franchises. The peculiarity of this Board was that it consisted of only one native American, an innkeeper. *The others were nearly all immigrants from Erin.* There was also a German and a Canadian. Their callings were not quite so aristocratic as might be expected from their position. One 'honourable Alderman' was a butcher, another a pawnbroker; there were two bootmakers, a printer, and several keepers of publichouses or ginshops, &c. Perhaps these 'honourables' were none the worse for that, but they evidently lacked a sufficient proportion of honesty to enable them to resist bribery of the most scandalous description."

Up to this time American politicians, who have been anxious to court Irish support by opposition to and a tax upon England, have been obliged to content themselves with mere Platonic demonstrations in the shape of resolutions in the State Legislatures, and occasionally in Congress. The resolutions in favour of Mr. Gladstone's new scheme have come exclusively from the Irish in the States, and from a section of political wire-pullers who wish to flatter the Irish vote. Just so, the Quebec legislature telegraphed, in 1886, a resolution of sympathy; but that only represented the French-Canadian Separatists. The bulk of Canadian feeling is for the Union, as also are the majority of Non-Irish Americans. It is true that a private warfare of a most atrocious and infamous kind was carried on between 1880 and 1884 against this country by the band of assassins, under the leadership of Irish refugees like O'Donovan Rossa and Patrick Ford, who have their headquarters in New York. This open propaganda of dynamite and destruction which was worked by the Irish-American conspirators would not be tolerated in any other country, and probably not in any other great city, even in the United States. But the New York authorities are powerless against the Irish vote, and that O'Donovan Rossa and his colleagues knew well.

The Irish are not popular in the United States outside their own circles. By the native Americans, who are mostly of English blood, and by the Germans, who have of late years immigrated in enormous numbers, especially to the Western States, the Irish element is by no means beloved. It is a curious and perhaps a suggestive fact that the Irish do not, as a rule, colonise in the

same way in which the Germans do. The latter at once seek the new regions of the far west and throw themselves with energy into agriculture or any other industry that offers. They make excellent and hardworking citizens. They flourish and prosper. The Irish immigrants, on the other hand, for the most part, hang about the great towns of the East, and form a numerous and more or less floating and poor population, which is a source of much trouble and anxiety to American politicians—quite as great a difficulty indeed as in English home politics. The Irish vote has, however, to be reckoned with. It numbers hundreds of thousands, and is a potent factor in American politics.

And here will come the danger of the future. Hitherto, as was said above, the anti-English action of American politicians has been of a platonic and more or less harmless character. They have, indeed, possessed no *pied-a-terre* for open interference. Ireland has been an integral part of the United Kingdom. The Irish, and all their affairs, have been under the direct sovereignty of the Imperial Parliament and the Monarch of the British Empire. It would be impossible, therefore, for any American politician, without absolutely reversing all the principles upon which international law is based, and without affirming a most monstrous and unheard of right of interference in the internal affairs of a foreign country, to deny the right of the Imperial Parliament to deal as it pleases with its Irish subjects. But once give Ireland a separate Parliament and deprive Irishmen of all control over Imperial affairs, and the whole situation will be reserved. *Ireland will then be regarded, certainly by the Irish in the States, as an independent, or at all events as a quasi-independent nation. Every dispute—and disputes are certain to be legion—which arises between the Imperial and the Irish Parliament will be treated by the Irish wirepullers in the States as a grievance and a cause for agitation.* The National League, or its equivalent, will oppose the payment of the tribute of £2,370,000 as arranged in Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule Bill, or any other contribution to the Imperial Exchequer, or will demand for the Irish Parliament the collection of the customs, or the right to establish the Roman Church, or the right of interference in some foreign question. Then the whole pack of agitators in the United States will be started in full cry against Great Britain, and with very menacing results. A "Home Rule" Act would give the Irish conspirators in America the very ground and basis for interference which they now lack. They would claim for Ireland the position of a separate nation. They would demand for the Irish Parliament all the powers and privileges of a sovereign legislature. There is too much danger that the ambitious and wirepulling politicians of the United States may be tempted to enter upon the

inclined plane of concessions to Irish agitation, from which, when once entered upon, it will be almost impossible to draw back.

THE DANGER IN IRELAND.

That is the danger from the United States; but what is the danger in Ireland itself? How different and how infinitely graver will be the conditions under which foreign interference in Irish affairs will then be threatened? At present the whole control of Ireland, administrative, executive, financial, military, and police, is in the hands of the Imperial power. After a brief period under a separate Parliament the whole local administration of Ireland would be in the hands of the Nationalists and the Priests. There would be in every town and district local functionaries who would be under the direction of the extreme Irish leaders, and very probably, as the National League was for so long, under the ultimate control of the darker conspirators who furnished the funds and directed the policy from across the Atlantic. Mr. William O'Brien drew, in *United Ireland*, a graphic picture of "a hundred thousand of the hot-blooded youth of "Limerick flocking to learn French drill and to shoulder French "rifles." Precisely so. At present we can easily prevent any such contingency. But if Ireland once has a separate Parliament, no French drill will be needed. A foreign invader will find on his arrival the Irish already drilled and armed. There would be most likely a large Irish volunteer force, if not a regular army. At present it would be impossible for even a small filibustering band from the United States or elsewhere to set foot on Irish soil, without immediate destruction. Then, on the contrary, every local condition would exist to invite and to welcome the successful intervention of a foreign armament. A "Home Rule" scheme would create, close on our western shores, an organised, a disciplined, and an armed power, instead of a powerless, though discontented population. Mr. Gladstone admitted, in reply to a question in the House of Commons on March 11th, that the establishment of an Irish Volunteer force was not expressly forbidden in the present Bill as it was forbidden by the Bill of 1886.

GENERAL INTERNATIONAL COMPLICATIONS.

Not only are troubles certain to arise with the United States, but with other Foreign Governments as well. Great Britain will, under Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule scheme, be fully responsible to other powers for Ireland. But supposing the Irish sympathise strongly with one of two countries at war, as they did with France in 1870, or with the Pope in 1860, what is to prevent the Irish local authorities, who are to be supreme in that country, from winking at the wholesale breach of the Foreign Enlistment

Act, or from allowing privateers like the *Alabama* to escape from Irish ports. The Imperial Government will be powerless to prevent these perilous acts, which may plunge us into war; but we shall be held wholly responsible for these consequences. If Irish indiscretion does involve the Empire in war, still under Mr. Gladstone's monstrous Bill, Ireland was to bear no share whatever in the cost of such a war. The powerlessness of the United States Central Government in dealing with the lynching of Italians at New Orleans, in the State of Louisiana, is a warning as to what would happen under a separate Irish parliament. There can be little doubt that directly a "Home Rule" Bill is passed, Ireland would become the home of every Anarchist, Revolutionist, and Dynamitard who seeks a secure and convenient refuge or *point d'appui*.

V.—THE BETRAYAL OF LOYAL IRISHMEN.

Vide Appendix xlvi. "Revolt of Loyalists."

The injustice offered to Ulster is the most grievous and revolting feature of "Home Rule." Ulster is far and away the most prosperous and progressive portion of Ireland. The chief manufacturing industries of Ireland are to be found in Ulster. The great linen industry is the staple of Ulster, and a main source of its prosperity.

At the annual meeting of the Belfast Chamber of Commerce in February, 1892, the President (Mr. Mitchell), said:—

"Last year a census of the United Kingdom was taken. The population of our city was returned as 255,896, as compared with 208,122 in 1881, an increase of 47,774, being equal to 23 per cent.—a very striking increase, which indicates the rapid prosperity of our city. The inhabited houses in Belfast in 1891 were 46,432, as compared with 34,982 in 1881, and our valuations during last year amounted to £738,404, as compared with £597,913 in 1881. *Our population now exceeds that of Dublin*, as, according to the last census, the population of the metropolis amounted to 254,709, as compared with 246,602 in 1881, being an increase of 5,107, which is equal to 2 per cent. The following is a list of the eight principal ports of the Kingdom as regards revenue and their collections under that department for 1890:—

"London	£9,834,171	Bristol	£1,323.445
Liverpool ...	3,263,301	Dublin	904,028
Belfast	2,128,449	Leith	669,907
Glasgow	1,341,435	Newcastle ...	378,319

"It will be observed that Belfast comes third on this list, the only ports exceeding her in revenue being London and Liverpool. The Customs revenue of our port for 1891 amounted to *£2,247,528*, being an increase over 1890 of £119,082. *Belfast contributes the magnificent sum of over three and a half millions to the Imperial Exchequer.* The statistics connected with our harbour give ample evidence of continued prosperity, not only in respect to the increase of shipping, arriving and departing, but also in regard to the increasing business transacted by the Harbour Board. The total tonnage cleared from the port during 1891 amounted to 1,931,177, as against 1,840,666 for 1890, while the revenue of the port for last year was £121,533. This is an exceedingly satisfactory state of affairs in respect of revenue; when we take into account the fact that a reduction

of about 20 per cent. was made some time ago on the dues on goods. The surplus this year amounts to £25,674, as compared with £25,689 last year. The value of the total property under the jurisdiction of the Belfast Harbour Commissioners now amounts to the enormous sum of *£1,360,973*."

At a meeting of the Belfast Corporation, on March 1st, 1893, it was stated that by the Home Rule Bill the loss in connection with municipal matters would be £76,000, independently of £15,000 in connection with the poor law. To meet this an increased taxation of 2s. 6d. in the pound would be necessary.

To illustrate the injustice of the Bill of 1893 to Irish loyalists, A. H. writes in the *St. James's Gazette* of February 18th, 1893:—

"Perhaps it may not be irrelevant to consider whether the Nationalists or the Unionists would be the losers by the reduction and the re-distribution which it would entail. The population of Ireland in 1891 was 4,705,000; this number, divided among 80 members, gives rather less than 59,000 inhabitants to a member. The 21 constituencies (excluding the University) which at presesent return Unionist members, contain a population of 1,150,000; the remaining constituencies, which return Nationalists, have a population of 3,555,000. It requires, therefore, no great knowledge of arithmetic to see that, out of 80 members, Nationalist Ireland would be entitled to sixty, and Unionist Ireland to 20; whereas, out of the present number of 101 members, the Nationalists have 80 and the Unionists 21.

"Here, then, is the reason why the present constituencies are retained for the Dublin Parliament. If the new ones had been used, the Nationalists would have lost 20 seats in that august assembly, while the Unionists lost but one. And Mr. Gladstone, in proposing (without a hint as to the true state of the case) to perpetuate the injustice from which the Irish Unionists at present suffer, deprecates 'the suspicion which is the besetting sin of politicians.'

"Moreover, it must not be forgotten that the injustice is yearly increasing. The population of Ireland as a whole has declined 9·1 per cent. during the last 10 years. The only important exceptions to the general decrease were the Unionists' boroughs of Belfast (which increased 23·2 per cent.) and Londonderry (which increased 12·8 per cent.). To these may be added, curiously enough, the one Unionist division of Dublin. St. Stephen's Green, in which the population has increased 10·8 per cent., while in the rest of the city it has slightly declined."

Mr. Goschen gave in the House of Commons (in 1886) some remarkable facts connected with the prosperity of Ulster:—

"I believe that the whole financial equilibrium would break down if Ulster be excluded. The total return for all Ireland under Schedule D was £9,900,000. Excluding Dublin, the total return was £5,600,000, and 45 per cent of that amount came from Ulster. Now, of the nine counties of Ulster, four are predominantly loyal—namely, Antrim, Armagh, Down, and Londonderry. These counties, which in 1885 returned to Parliament fifteen Loyalists and four Parnellites, show a return of £2,220,000 under Schedule D. The remaining five counties, which are predominantly Nationalist, and which returned to Parliament thirteen Nationalists and only one Loyalist, show a return under Schedule D of only £300,000. The question whether Ulster is to be excluded from this legislation is left open for Committee. It is, I think, a monstrous thing that it should be so left open. Anything more startling than the statement that the inclusion of Ulster was not a vital point in the Bill I never heard. I want to know what will be the future of Ulster industries under Home Rule, and what will be the conduct of the Nationalists in relation to those industries. In the *Belfast Morning News*, the paper of a hon. member opposite, it was recently suggested that the linen trade had been a scourge and not a blessing to Ulster:—

"'But for the linen trade Ulster could never have been rack-rented as it was, and as it continues to be. . . . But for the stone of flax, the hank of yarn, the web

of linen, the grinding landlord exactions which have kept Ulster poor, could not have been put in force. . . . The two are identical—for the linen trade of Ulster is solidly Orange. As an interest, and a powerful interest, it is the worst and most formidable enemy of the Irish people. To Northern public opinion the "linenites" are case-hardened. To Southern and Western public opinion they may be more amenable—more especially if South and West resolve to do for linen what they did for land—if South and West rise up and establish a Flax and Linen League. . . . *But, above and beyond all, American public opinion may be relied on as most effective with the unteachable "linenites."*"

As Mr. Goschen observed

"Such views do not bode much good to the linen industry of Ulster."

The above quotation from a Nationalist paper is an excellent example of the illogical and mad views upon economical, as well as upon political subjects, that are in vogue among the revolutionaries of Ireland. The Loyalists of Ulster are largely of British blood, and Protestant in religion. Ulster has been for centuries the basis and backbone of British power and influence in Ireland. It is by reason of their fidelity to the British connection. and their unswerving devotion to the Union, that the Loyalists of Ulster, and the Loyalists who are scattered throughout the three southern provinces, a mere helpless handful amongst a hostile population, are to be exposed to spoliation, ruin, and even to massacre. How hopeless would be the condition of the Irish Loyalists is evident from the fact that, over and above the taxation necessary to raise the Imperial customs and excise, "a general power of taxation would pass unequivocally into the hands of the domestic legislation of Ireland." The new Irish Parliament would also have complete control over the Civil Service, the magistracy, the judges, and the police; in fact, over the entire administration of Ireland. The terrible precedents of rebel ferocity in 1798, and in 1641, warn us what another outbreak would involve. It will be no child's play for the Loyalists in Munster, Leinster, and Connaught, if the Nationalists control the administration and judiciary of Ireland. The temper and tendencies of the great mass of the Irish population have been painfully demonstrated during times of license. The Irish Parliament would have power to organise and equip a police force. They can create a formidable force recruited mainly in the south, and can maintain that force in Ulster at the expense of Ulster. Refusal to fulfil their pecuniary obligations is probably the least of the evils the Irish Loyalists will have to expect from their Celtic neighbours.

Horrible, atrocious outrages upon innocent and helpless men, women, and children, have been deplorably common. Mutilation and maiming of human beings, and even of the dumb and harmless beasts of the field, have been practised in many parts of Celtic Ireland. The stimulus of interested agitators,

the incitements of the assassination Press, and the long indifference and weakness of Mr. Gladstone's Ministry, destroy healthy public feeling in Ireland. So soon demoralised and debased did the tone of the people become in 1881 and 1882 that these crimes were nowhere execrated but actually aroused sympathy and admiration. Foul assassinations not of landlords only, but of poor men who dared to be honest and loyal, were then matters of almost daily occurrence in Ireland. These murders would have been numbered by thousands instead of hundreds, but for the restraining presence of the armed police and for the fear of that very majesty of the law which blind sentimentalists and reckless lawbreakers unite in miscalling "coercion." The Loyalists of Ireland bravely faced these tremendous and appalling dangers in order to maintain British power, the order of the United Kingdom, and the ascendency of law. They have borne anxieties and perils of which we in peaceful England have little conception. Are they, after all these sacrifices, and at the very crisis of their fate, to see themselves abandoned. helpless and hopeless, to those who have always been their own bitterest foes and the enemies of England? No wonder that the Loyalists protest with all the energy of which they are capable against this policy of separation. The grotesque injustice of Mr. Gladstone's policy is well exposed in the following extract:—

"Mr. Gladstone proposes to intensify this aversion of the capitalist for Irish soil. He will hand over law and justice in the island to the very men who, through an illegal organisation, have laughed at lawful decrees and frustrated justice. The new Ireland will require millions of money to start it well; but where are they to be found? Not in Lombard Street, not in Dublin, not at Belfast. Who make the bulk of the Irish payments to the Consolidated Fund? Not the followers of Mr. Parnell, but the Upper and middle classes who renounce him and all his works. *Dublin and North-East Ulster pay five-sixths of the income-tax*, and the same localities probably pay five-sixths of the indirect taxes. In fact, the division of the taxable wealth of Ireland is in inverse ratio to the political lines. It is impossible to attain exact accuracy in the calculation; but it may be safely said that the *Loyalists*—including the landlords, the merchants, the manufacturers, the professional men, and all classes in North-East Ulster—*contribute five-sixths of the revenue we now derive from Ireland.* If, therefore, the representation of that country is to be based on taxation, we should go further. and make the people taxed the principal constituents. Were such a principle to be applied in practice, Ireland, instead of returning to Westminster the present proportion, would send eighty-five Loyalists and about eighteen Parnellites. But Mr. Gladstone has based the Irish representation on poverty and disloyalty, not on loyalty and wealth. He goes further, and says that not alone are the peasants in huts to command five-sixths of the representation at Westminster, but they are to obtain through a native Parliament complete control of the wealth which their co-residents in the island have amassed through generations of enterprise, industry, and thrift. There never was in the history of the world such a premium put on early marriages, large families, indolence, want of enterprise, and unthrift. There never was such a discouragement to capital, intelligence, industry, and toil.

Of two brothers—one a Scotchman settled in Glasgow, and the other a Scotchman settled in Belfast—the former will find his factories, his money, his property, his person still safe and sound under the ægis of British law; but the latter will be placed under the thumb of men who are successful Socialists, and who have elevated outrage and plunder into a political art. No compensation is even offered to persons who will find themselves hampered in every operation of their commerce by the word 'Ireland' at the head of their bills. Industrial Ulster contains a population attached to their creed, resentful of Romanist dictation, proud of their loyalty and their obedience to law profoundly detesting the atrocities of the South; yet what will be their position under a Parnellite Parliament? They will be a minority detested because they retain affection for everything English. Their own cities have a low Catholic populace ready to rise at the word of command from the South. Emissaries from America have already denounced their linen trade as 'Orange' in its source. The progress of this controversy will deepen the discord ever ready to break out. They desire no lot or part in the new Ireland 'built in the eclipse' of Mr. Gladstone's study, and 'rigged with curses dark' of bewildered and disgusted Liberals. Parnellite judges, Parnellite magistrates, and a Parnellite police will ultimately dominate Ulster. All the property of the Protestants will be at the mercy of Catholic legislation, backed by Catholic mobs. Now, it may be said as regards the landlords that they suffer for the sins of their fathers. The merchants, the manufacturers, the operatives of Ulster, however, have committed no offences. Their sins are loyalty to the Queen, love for England, patient industry, honourable thrift. Yet they are handed over helpless to a majority of Roman Catholics, who hate them as old political and religious enemies. We rescue our isolated sentinels in the South; we compensate lords and gentlemen about to lose their broad acres; but we offer no consolatory millions to the Irishmen of Scotch and English descent who have made Ulster an oasis, and who feel no sympathy whatever with Socialism, Parnellism, Rebellion, or Green Flags. Through invidious taxation, or partisan magistrates, or a popular police their liberties, their properties, perhaps their lives, may be endangered; but they are to be left to the mercy of their hereditary foes."

THE DESPAIR OF THE LOYAL IRISHMEN.

No more touching or effective protest against the betrayal of Loyal Irishmen has been made than the following letter from an Irish widow to Mr. Gladstone, dated March 13th, 1893. This Irish lady, Mrs. Luke White, then wrote the following letter to Mr. Gladstone:—

"Sir,—I pray you to read this letter. We are told in Ireland that you see no papers, read no letters, which do not uphold your views, but I pray you, in the name of thousands of women in Ireland, to listen for a few moments while *I tell you, though in feeble words, what are our misery and despair at the prospect of your Home Rule Bill becoming law.* I have only one consolation, and thank God with all my heart that I am a widow, and that my husband is beyond the reach of this calamity. Broken down in body and mind by the trials of the year 1881 and those following, I can now thank God he died, and this feeling, Sir, is shared by others similarly placed. If your Bill passes there will be *an exodus from Ireland of every Protestant and many Roman Catholics who can possibly leave the country, for we know what we may expect.* I am thankful that on my husband's death the insurance money which he left for our support was not invested in Ireland. We felt, Sir, that if you were in power again, brought in by your miscalled Nationalists, there would be no safety, no security, for any investment in Ireland. In your Bill of 1886 you distinctly said that the land question could not be left to an Irish Parliament to settle. In this Bill you have omitted all mention of the land, giving the so-called owners three years of grace, and then handing them over to

the Irish Parliament. It was depending on the good faith and security of the British Government that we mothers and fathers have denied ourselves many things to be able to give our sons the education to fit them for the Civil Service. Are they to be ruined with ourselves? *I hope and trust that my only son, and every other loyal Irishman, will join Ulster in fighting for our freedom. Better, far better, for them so to die, than try to exist under the government of Archbishop Walsh.* Your supporters, Sir, in Ireland may gain; they cannot lose, for they have no stake in the country. They are not among the merchants, shopkeepers, or business men; they are not of the professional class; they are but political agitators; and, to advance their own ends, they go about trying to persuade the tenants that under Home Rule they will have the land for nothing, and some of them implicitly believe this false rule. The last few years we have had a little rest, and while we prayed with all our hearts 'Give peace in our time, oh Lord,' we were feeling a little hopeful for the future. Now all this is at an end if your Home Rule Bill is allowed to pass.—I am, yours faithfully, ELIZ. WHITE, Dublin."

Can Englishmen and Scotchmen endure to surrender their brethren, loyal and faithful, and imperilled by reason of their very loyalty and fidelity, to this most cruel wrong and to heart-rending despair? Perish the thought! It is too infamous, too base to ever prevail with a generous people. When once Englishmen realise what this fatal scheme of separation means for the Empire, and for the loyalists of Ireland, they will scout its very mention. The Imperial Anglo-Saxon race, that has pioneered the civilisation of the world, peopled vast continents, and built up a matchless dominion, will never yield its Empire to disruption, nor its faithful friends to ruin. To quote the memorable words which Lord Salisbury addressed to the great Unionist meeting on April 14th, 1886, and the truth of which has been so marvellously borne out by the prosperity of Ireland after six years of Unionist Government:—

"My belief is that the future government of Ireland does not involve any such unmanageable difficulty, if the people of this country will be true to the Empire to which they belong. (Loud cheers.) *We want a wise, firm, continuous administration of the law.* (Cheers.) But you must support it, or it will not take place. We want a steady policy that no considerations of weariness or difficulty at Westminster, that no considerations attaching to the manifold ties of party government under which we live, shall drive aside from its strong course the policy upon which the people of England have decided. It is not enough for them to decide it. They must watch over it when it is decided; they must by their constant and steady support, by the overwhelming force of their will, sweep away this body of resistance which has hitherto at Westminster prevented anything like a steady, or constant, or wholesome policy for Ireland (cheers); for this matter, believe me, does not concern Ireland alone. There is a great responsibility upon you, and it will be a terrible thing if through your weakness the Irish people are abandoned to the anarchy under which assuredly they will fall. But there is something more which you, as the owners of a vast Empire extending to the ends of the earth, must consider before you take this fatal step downwards to which your rulers are inviting you now. There has been a great contest between England and the discontented portion of the Irish people. It is a contest that has lasted through many generations past, through many vicissitudes, and now you are asked to submit to a measure which is placed before you, and to end that contest by a complete and ignominious surrender. (Cheers.) It is not a surrender marked by the more ordinary circumstances of ignominy. It is a painful thing for a nation

to lose a great battle and have to acknowledge defeat. It is a painful thing if that defeat entails the loss of territory, and the nation has to be contented with a restricted empire. But these things do not represent the depth of infamy to which you will descend. There is something worse than all this, and that is when defeat is marked by the necessity of abandoning to your enemies those whom you have called upon to defend you, and who have risked their all on your behalf. (Loud cheers.) That is an infamy below which it is impossible to go ; that is an infamy to which you are asked to submit yourself now."

THE MISREPRESENTATION OF IRELAND.

The following points are dealt with by Mr. R. L. Jenkins in his brochure :—

(1.) The anomalous representation of Ireland in the Imperial Parliament, created by Mr. Gladstone's jerrymandering in 1885.

(2.) The proposed anomalous representation of Ireland in the Legislative Assembly at Dublin, to be established under Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule Bill of 1893.

(3.) The anomalous representation of Ireland in the Imperial Parliament, proposed by Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule Bill of 1893.

Dealing with these seriatim, Mr. Jenkins says:—

(1.) (*a*) General Average.—The total constituencies in Ireland number 747,829 voters, who are at present represented in the Imperial Parliament by 103 members, giving an average of 1 member to every 7,260 voters.

(*b*) Constituency Party Average.—The 747,829 are so divided that 561,027 belong to 80 constituencies represented by Home Rulers, and 186,802 belong to 23 constituencies represented by Unionists. The 561,027 voters in Home Rule constituencies therefore have an average of 1 member to every 7,012 voters. The 186,802 voters in Unionist constituencies have an average of 1 member to every 8,121 voters, or on an average a Unionist has 1,000 more voters in his constituency than a Nationalist. And while the Nationalist average is 200 voters below the general average, the Unionist average is nearly 900 above the general average.

(*c*) Party Strength Average.—Of the 747,829 voters in Ireland, Mr. Jenkins assumes that 570,443 voted at last election. (*It should be remembered, however, that in cases of unopposed returns, he puts down the whole constituency to the party holding the seat, there being no reliable method of ascertaining the balance of parties in such constituencies.* It should also be noted that Cork City returns 2 members, and has 16,295 votes credited as cast at last election, but there are only 10,276 voters on the register.) Out of the above 570,443 he gives 387,828 as voting for Parnellites or anti-

Parnellites, and 182,615 for Conservatives or Liberal Unionists. The 387,828 Parnellites or anti-Parnellites return 80 members, or an average of 1 member to every 4,847 votes they cast. The 182,615 Conservatives and Liberal Unionists are represented by 23 members, or an average of 1 member to every 7,939 Loyalist votes. Thus if Loyalist opinion had representation on the same scale as Home Rule opinion, there would be 37 Unionists instead of 23; or if Home Rule opinion were put on a level with Unionist opinion, there would be 48 Home Rulers instead of 80—but this would leave Mr. Gladstone in a minority.

(*d*) Constituencies.—Having disposed of the various tests by average, let us glance at particular constituencies or groups of constituencies. There are 45 divisions returning members in Ireland containing less than 7,000 voters, that is 260 less than the general average shown above. Of these 47, 42 are represented by Home Rulers and 5 by Unionists.

Of the 42 divisions represented by Nationalists, 17 contain less than 6,000 voters; 4 contain less than 5,000 voters; 2 contain less than 4,000 voters; and three constituencies have respectively only 1,909, 1,806, and 1,847 voters. The five Unionist divisions containing less than 7,000 voters, are Dublin University (2) 4,352; Fermanagh (N.) 5,937; Londonderry City, 5 161; Tyrone County, 6,481; so, except for the Dublin University, the most glaring anomalies rest with the Nationalist representation.

It will be seen that taking the total constituencies of Counties and Boroughs, most of the Unionist Counties and Boroughs have at present over 8,000 voters to every member returned. In only 10 cases have Nationalist Counties and Boroughs a similar proportion. The figures speak for themselves, and show how gross is the misrepresentation of Ireland in the Imperial Parliament.

(2.) Although Mr. Gladstone recognises that the distribution of seats in Ireland is unfair—for he proposes to alter the representation in the Imperial Parliament from 103 to 80, knocking off 18 Nationalist members—yet he proposes that the Legislative Assembly in Dublin shall be composed of 103 members, returned under the distribution of seats which is shown in paragraph 1 to be grossly unjust, and he professes to protect the minority! It is to be hoped that Unionists will not tamely submit to this injustice. If the Irish Legislative Assembly is reduced to 80 (as it should be), the Loyalists will number about 30.

(3.) A very cursory glance at the comparative table will show that Mr. Gladstone is still "jerrymandering" the Irish representation to the Imperial Parliament. Antrim County (C.), with

36,319 voters, has its representation reduced to a level with Donegal County (N.), containing only 26,005 voters. Down County, with its 37,973 voters, is deprived of 1 member (reducing members to 3), although Dublin City, with only 33,655 voters, continues to return 4 members. Dublin County is to return only 2 members with 21,788 voters, though Kerry is to return 3 members with only 21,762 voters. Compare Cavan and Clare in the same way. Leitrim County, with 12,935 voters, will return 2 members, equal to Armagh County with 25,146 voters. Meath County will return 2 members for 12,528 voters, but Queen's County with 13,295 and Waterford County with 13,078 are reduced to 1 member each. And what are we to say of a re-distribution of seats which allows the following:—

Galway City...	1	member,	1,909 voters.
Kilkenny City,	1	,,	1,806 ,,
Newry	1	,,	1,847 ,,
Waterford ...	1	,,	3,974 ,,

In these cases, 9,536 voters are to return 4 members under the new distribution, although each of the divisions of Antrim will have 12,000 voters to return 1 member.

We have seen, then, how Mr. Gladstone's majority in Ireland for Home Rule is made up, and how he proposes to maintain it by further juggling. It is to be hoped that the Unionist party will be alive to this grave scandal, and not allow *Ireland to be captured* in the manner adopted in 1885.

As that well-known Home Ruler, Sir Charles Gavan Duffy, wrote in *The Times* of February 17th, 1893:—

"There is a powerful Unionist party in Ireland who would have to be reconciled to the new Parliament if we are to have tranquillity and prosperity in the country. A scheme which offered them a career in their native land would speedily win the young and ambitious to accept it, but there is no such offer in this measure. In the Legislative Assembly, which will be the centre of political power, which will control the public policy of the country, regulate finance, and make and unmake Governments, they would have about a dozen members out of 105, which is far below their legitimate share. With the three-cornered constituency or proportionate representation they would probably constitute a third of the Assembly, and such a party would get its turn of office whenever the Government lost the confidence of a section of its supporters by any unwise or unfair proposal. We cannot get responsible government, which is the thing promised us, without a party in office and another party able and willing to take their places; and mark this—if you have not responsible government, you must have party despotism."

GENERAL LOSS TO IRELAND.

Many of the principal industries in the north of Ireland and in Dublin would be removed from that country if the Home Rule

Bill was passed, and if Ulster was brought under the control of the Nationalist majority. Mr. James Henderson, speaking at the great meeting in Belfast, February 28th, 1893, referred to two of these industries which might be transplanted from Irish to British soil. There is the great shipbuilding yard of Messrs. Harland and Wolff, one of the largest in the world, which employs some 8,000 working men, and contributes an enormous sum to the prosperity of Belfast. There is also the great tobacco manufactory of Belfast, which contributes over £500,000 a year to the Imperial Exchequer. It is well known that the proprietors of Guinness's Brewery, which employs thousands of workpeople in Dublin, would remove that great industry to England if the Home Rule Bill becomes law.

The *Dublin Express* of February 28th, 1893, puts very well the loss which Ireland would suffer under the Home Rule Bill from the withdrawal of the Imperial grants to Ireland:—

"The farmers and labourers of Ulster care little, perhaps, for sentiment, but they appreciate the money value of legislation, if it has any, and if they find that they will have to pay heavily in the loss of advantages which they now derive from the Imperial connexion and from the increased burden of taxation which will be put upon them, they will have no hesitation in rejecting the Bill. They need no special instructions to enable them to calculate what they would obtain in return for the withdrawal of the Imperial grants, of which they have now the benefit. Who will supply the funds to enable them to buy their holdings under the Purchase Acts? Who will pay the proportion of poor rate which the State now contributes for medical charities. If they want loans to build farm-houses or buildings or to drain their lands, where are they to get them? Is it from the Treasury of an Irish Parliament which will have nothing in it to start with, and if it is ever full will be under the control of men who have rendered no account of the thousands which have passed through their hands, and are openly charged by their most intimate associates, since they quarrelled with each other, with having grossly misapplied them? The Government now pay 4s. a head for the maintenance of lunatics—a class which is largely on the increase. That contribution will cease in future, and will a Parliament in College Green make it good? A sum of £1,500,000 a year is granted for free education. When that stops who will make good the loss?"

As Mr. Balfour said in his speech at Ealing, on March, 8th, 1893:—

"Most of those who now listen to me are themselves personally interested, or are interested through their friends, in the great insurance societies (hear, hear), which, as I am given to understand, have vast sums invested in Irish mortgages. I want to ask what the value of Irish mortgages will be if this Bill becomes law. (Laughter and cheers.) Is there any human being who supposes that, with the duty of protecting the sheriff in collecting the rents due to a landlord left to the Irish Executive, it will ever be performed? Is there any one sanguine enough to suppose that if the sheriff is left unprotected he will be able to collect sixpence of rent from anybody? (Cheers.) I am confining my attention to English interests, and I do not ask what would happen to Irish landlords or those in Ireland interested in the land question. But, I ask, what is going to happen to the English mortgagees, to the great societies interested in Irish mortgages? Their security is not worth the paper on which they are written. But that is not all. I suppose

many of you have noticed the way in which Irish securities have fallen since the details of this precious scheme have become known to the Irish investors. What does that mean? It means that Home Rule will be followed by the exodus from Ireland of all that capital by which the prosperity of Ireland, such as it is, is maintained at its present level. (Cheers.) If Irish capital leaves Ireland what is to happen to the Irish labourer? *The Irish labourer will follow Irish capital, and he will leave Ireland* (laughter); and let every working man in England take this truth to heart. Home Rule will be most inevitably followed by a great increase in England of the competition with Irish labour. (Cheers.) In the counties and boroughs alike the Irish labourer will be compelled, whether he likes it or not, to come over and compete with his English brother; and more and more you will see the value of English labour driven down by Irish competition, more and more you will see the results of English municipal and Parliamentary elections not decided by the votes of Englishmen and Scotchmen, but decided by the votes of those who look for guidance, not to English and Scottish advisers, but to advisers on the other side of St. George's Channel. (Cheers.)"

The following extract also shows the way in which the Irish ratepayers would be affected under the Home Rule Bill:—"An illustration of the injurious effect of the Home Rule Bill in putting an end to contributions to Ireland from the Imperial Exchequer in aid of local rates was given on February 16th, at the meeting of the guardians of the South Dublin Union. Mr. Caldbeck, one of the guardians, brought under the notice of the board the answer given by Mr. Gladstone to Mr. Balfour's question whether, under the Home Rule Bill, the contributions from the Imperial Exchequer for local purposes in Ireland were to be continued, and Mr. Gladstone was reported to have said that 'Contributions from the Imperial Exchequer to the local revenue of Ireland would cease.' Mr. Caldbeck asked the clerk how that would affect the rates of that union. The clerk replied that they had received from probate duties lately about £4,000; Government contribution in lieu of rates on Government property, £1,500; in payment of medical and educational expenses, £1,300; in relief of sanitary officers' salaries, £270. That represented, at about the very least, on the valuation of the union, which stands at £700,000, about 3d. in the pound."—*Times*, February 17th, 1893.

With regard to Belfast, the following appeared in the *Northern Whig* of March 1st:—

"We publish this morning certain calculations with respect to the loss Belfast will sustain even in contributions which it has been accustomed to receive, and which have hitherto been regarded as a matter of course. There are, for instance, what are called the Imperial contributions to our local poor rates. They are estimated at fourpence in the pound. Assuming that we might have no more paupers to maintain than we have now—they are likely, under Home Rule, to greatly increase—it is estimated that we should as ratepayers have to find fourpence in the pound to meet the deficiency in the poor rate by the Imperial contribution being withdrawn. This is but a beginning. It is only a loss of one outside contribution which the ratepayers will have to make good.

"There is the cost of the police. The city pays fifteen thousand a year for these guardians of the public peace. The actual cost is about sixty thousand. Then come the clothing and the purchase of the barracks, on which in recent years some forty

thousand pounds have been spent. It is stated that this expense might have to be doubled Thus it might be found that the municipal rate would have an increase of fifty per cent., and the poor rate of twenty-five per cent. There are also the Imperial grants to gaols, to asylums, and to other institutions, all of which under Home Rule would have to be solely maintained at the expense of the ratepayers. It is thought that the loss to the city in this manner will amount annually to a hundred thousand pounds. This money will in some way or other have to be made up by the ratepayers. . . . It is calculated that an additional half-crown in the pound would be required on our present valuation to pay the amount mentioned."

The Irish will also suffer an undoubted loss in the question of lunatics. At present half the cost of the lunatics in Irish asylums, amounting to £111,989 in 1891, is paid for out of the Imperial Exchequer. This will cease under the Home Rule Bill, and unless 12,000 Irish lunatics are to be let loose upon the distressful country, the Irish ratepayers will have to pay this sum. At present the Board of Works advances British money at a very low rate of interest for the building and repair of Irish asylums. In future the money will have to be found on Irish credit—that is, at a much higher rate of interest.

THE WHOLE MORE IMPORTANT THAN A PART.

One of Mr. Gladstone's chief arguments in favour of the Bill is that eighty Irish members demand it. But the Imperial Parliament consists of 670 members; and why should the will of eighty Irishmen prevail against that of the 590 other members? If eighty obstinate and aggresive members are to impose their will upon Parliament, what a dangerous precedent will be established! At any time, a determined clique may be formed, which will demand some special legislation, or even separation. Would the people of Great Britain consent to give Wales, or Cornwall, or Yorkshire, or even Scotland, the right of separation? Again, if eighty Nationalists may force separation from Great Britain upon their 589 fellow-members, why should not the nineteen Ulster Loyalists insist upon having Ulster separated from the rest of Ireland, and prevail over the eighty Nationalists upon a point so vital to Ulster. The argument—of which Mr. Gladstone made much—that even good laws are disliked by the Irish people because they are "foreign," and come in a "foreign garb," is a very empty and mischievous one. It rests on the vaguest sentiment, and is just the sort of reasoning which delights Mr. Gladstone's unpractical and fanciful mind, and which, in his hands, has worked enormous mischief. It is an ignominious and overwhelming confession of failure on the part of Mr. Gladstone, who has been for twenty-five years labouring to pacify Ireland by heroic and incessant legislation, legislation all of which he now describes as "foreign and detested." Supposing

the Irish Celts—who are, after all, only two-thirds of the Irish population—do regard laws made by the Imperial Parliament as "foreign," is that a sufficient reason why the Empire should be dismembered, the Loyalists of Ireland abandoned to ruin, and infinite injury inflicted upon Great Britain? The whole is more important than the part. It is puerile to the last degree to assume for an instant that this sentimental grievance of some three millions of disaffected Irishmen should prevail against the interests of nearly thirty-five millions of loyal Englishmen, Scotchmen, and Irishmen, to say nothing of the 340,000,000 of our fellow-subjects in distant lands.

MR. GLADSTONE'S EPITHET "FOREIGN."

Ridiculous as his argument may be, the bare mention by Mr. Gladstone of this word "foreign" did infinite, perhaps irreparable, harm. For centuries Ireland has been an integral portion of these Kingdoms. Irishmen have borne their share in building up the Empire, and have taken a brilliant part in arms and politics, as well as in all other professional life of the whole country. To speak of a native of Ireland as "foreign" is a monstrous paradox. But the influence that the use of such a word, and of the policy which Mr. Gladstone has instituted, may be far more grevious and terrible in our dependencies and colonies even than in Ireland. The effect upon our splendid and precious dominion in India may be disastrous. India is wonderfully and admirably governed by laws, British made and administered in the main by British officials. Under our law and our rule over two hundred and fifty millions of the Queen's subjects in India enjoy a beneficent government to which they had before been absolute strangers. But there are ambitions, and jealousies, and race antagonisms in India. Once teach the Hindoo agitators that the Prime Minister of the Queen regards the laws and the rule under which they live as "Foreign," and therefore hateful to them, and a frightful impetus will be given to native discontent and to Imperial disruption. Home Rule or separation will be demanded by this and that race and government of India with ever increasing pressure. This Bill will be the lever and polestar of all those dangerous influences, within and without, which are ready and anxious to break up the Empire of England. *Foreign rivals and foreign foes are watching eagerly*, and with hopeful ambition, the disruption and enfeeblement of the widest and wealthiest dominion that the world has ever known. Russia is burning to be our legatee in Hindostan. France would gladly take our place in the Mediterranean and the far East. Even Germany, good and valuable ally as she is to England, when our power is firmly and consistently maintained

by ministers of courage and resolve, could not be expected to forego the tempting inheritance of our Colonial possessions.

The Duke of Argyll, in his powerful speech at Glasgow, on April 21st, 1886, vehemently attacked Mr. Gladstone's use of the word "Foreign":—

"Let me say a word as to the precaution, the limitations, the securities which Mr. Gladstone has invented. I believe them not to be worth the paper on which they are written, and, what is more, I tell you this—that Mr. Gladstone has himself, by his recent speeches, put into the hands of the Irish people a weapon with which they will be justified in destroying it, for what was he tempted to say? He said that we were a foreign people to the Irish, and I suppose that if we are foreign to the Irish people the Irish people are foreign to us. Well, now, look what will happen. The new Parliament will assemble in Dublin, if this Bill passes, and the Irish patriots will say, 'Look here, here is the Prime Minister of England telling you that the Acts passed at Westminster are the Acts of a foreign Parliament. That Parliament imposed a tribute of seven millions sterling upon us. That is a foreign tribute; away with it.' Well, gentlemen, there will be our ships coursing round the coasts of Ireland; there will be our forts planted on the headlands of the Irish coast, and we shall have Nationalists pointing out and saying, 'Look here, Mr. Gladstone has taught us to say these ships are foreign ships, that these forts are foreign forts, let us pull them down, let us send torpedoes against the fleets.' I do not see what the argument is. If our former legislation was foreign so will this Bill be foreign. It will be passed at Westminster, and then look at the conditions which Ireland professes to accept. Ireland has no longer anything to do with Imperial policy. *There are thirteen great subjects in this Bill from which Irishmen are forever excluded.* They are Imperial subjects. Irishmen are to have nothing to say to them? Do you think that that condition of things is likely to last? Will not the Irish say, and say justly, 'these are humiliations put upon us by a foreign Power, and a foreign Parliament, and we will not submit to them?' Therefore I say that all limitations, weak in themselves, weakly conceived, and weak in their own nature, will be blown up as it were by gunpowder, by the force which Mr. Gladstone has put into that terrible word 'foreign.' (Cheers.) I join in that protest of my distinguished friend, your chairman, as to the use of this word 'foreign.' It was not only in my opinion a monstrous word to use in Great Britain and the United Kingdom, it was a fatal word to use; but besides being wrong, in my opinion morally wrong, historically wrong, it is pure nonsense. (Cheers.) *The Irish people are of the same race as ourselves; there is a large Celtic element in them;* and so I rejoice to say there is in Scotland. I have been looking back lately into old documents connected with the 11th, 12th, and 13th centuries in this country, and I was amazed to find that even down so far into the low country as the county of Fife, the great mass of the population were of Celtic stock and spoke Gaelic up to a very recent date. (Cheers.) *We are a mixed people;* happily under the providence of Heaven our mixed races always have been the strongest. *In our blood, in England, Scotland, and in Ireland as well, the Saxon, Dane, and Norman have united in a happy and glorious combination.* You may depend upon it that if *Mr. Parnell* and his followers accept this Bill *they accept it only as a step.* (Hear, hear.) The fact of their submitting to such humiliating conditions as regards Imperial policy is, in my mind, an absolute proof that they do not mean to keep to it; they mean to make it a stepping stone to final and to total separation. The link to the Crown will become a mere nominal link; and their proclivities and their tendencies, if they remain as they are, will be, I grieve to say, with the enemies of the United Kingdom. (Cheers.) I deny that we have a moral right to cast adrift the Irish people. (Cheers.) We have no right, no moral right, to abandon two-fifths of the people of Ireland, the Protestant minority, and not the

Protestant minority only, but a very large proportion of Catholics also who object to it—(cheers)—no right to abandon the Protestant minority as such—you have no right to abandon the commercial classes as such—the bankers, the lawyers, the merchants of Belfast and Dublin, who with one voice have protested against that. I have Irish blood in my own veins. (Loud cheers.) I was born in a house and brought up in a house in this beautiful valley of the Clyde, in the ancient province of Lennox, in which the sacred words, 'my mither,' when I heard them in childhood were always spoken of an Irish woman. (Cheers.) I deny, I repudiate the language of Mr. Gladstone. *The Irish are not foreign to us, and we are not foreign to them.* (Cheers.) *They are bone of our bone, and flesh of our flesh.* (Hear, hear.) They have contributed to our national glory great warriors, great lawyers, great statesmen—among them one of the greatest statesmen that ever graced the Parliament of Westminster—Edmund Burke. (Cheers.) They have contributed to build up this glorious Empire; we wish to keep them united to us; we wish to keep them members of our glorious dominions, and under the security of our united lands." (Loud cheers.)

The maintenance of the British Empire is a question of vital import to the masses of our people. Strip England of her possessions abroad and these islands, now the centre and heart of a mighty and wealthgiving Empire, would sink to the level of a third-rate power. With Empire will go our commerce and manufacture; and with the loss of trade, the sustenance and lifeblood of our working classes are taken away. The population of these islands would be reduced one-half, either by emigration or by the terrible alternative of starvation. Destitution and ruin and misery of the most appalling kind would reign throughout the land. The poorest classes would suffer the most, for the margin that separates them from want is the narrowest. Great social and economical catastrophes always most effect the wage-earning classes. It behoves the working men of England and Scotland, if they value their own dearest interests, to resist a scheme that will be absolutely fatal to their wellbeing.

AN APPEAL FROM ULSTER.

The Rev. Dr. Kane, the well-known Ulster Loyalist, concluded a brilliant speech at St. James' Hall, on June 22nd, with the following appeal:

He did not agree that the voice of the majority ought to prevail (laughter), and in Ireland, dominated by a coterie who boycotted and bulleted, the majority was sure to be bad. But, after all, the majority of the people in the United Kingdom were not in favour of Home Rule. When they knew how the majority was obtained in Ireland the majority ought not to prevail. *Ought three millions of people, most of them illiterate, be in a position to demand a change which would affect the whole of the United Kingdom?* Only for his respect for age he should repeat what the late Mr. Spurgeon said, that only a madman could propose the Home Rule Bill. (Cheers.) If he did not say it (laughter) he believed it. (Hear, hear.) Now they might ask him—what do you demand? They demanded nothing. They were content with the same legislation as the rest of the United Kingdom. They deserved at least as much as the moonlighters of Kerry, and yet they did not make or presume to make a demand for a separate Parliament. They came there to tell them that poor Ireland had had a chequered history, and that the only change that she had had was during the last 100 years under the legislative Union with Great

Britain. Nothing had retarded her progress or hindered her happiness except the restless, lawless spirit which had been the curse of Ireland during all her history. (Hear, hear.) They had adjured the English people in the name of their common empire not to cast Ireland back into the cauldron of agitation under the delusion that they were bestowing upon her self-government. They told the English people that during the last six years the country had enjoyed wonderful peace. ("Cheers for Balfour.") Let them renew the lease of power of those statesmen who had achieved that victory for Ireland and piloted her into the harbour of peace and happiness. (Cheers.) Was this making any special demand for Ulster? *Their position was this—one Sovereign, one Constitution, one Parliament, one Kingdom, together with the fullest civil and religious liberty*, and equal justice for all the people of every creed and party inhabiting the British Islands. (Cheers.) That was their position, and they besought them not to heed the bluster and jeering of Sir W. Harcourt (loud groans and hisses), who was so beautifully stewing in his own Parnellite juice. Do not let them be misled by the imbecile platitudes and miserable cant of Mr. Gladstone. (Cheers and a voice, "Let him have it.") Do not let these things blind them to the fact that within the next few weeks they had to give before God and the country a solemn and faithful deliverance, in which was bound up with the honour of the Sovereign the greatness of their Empire and the civil and religious liberty of their fellow-subjects in Ireland. (Cheers.) There was just one other point. He agreed with Lord Londonderry that they were in a difficulty. If they spoke out their minds they were called rebels; if they used moderate language they were said to have given only a lukewarm allegiance to Lord Salisbury. But he should like to ask one question. What reception would a Home Rule Parliament meet in Ulster and from Irish Loyalists? (Loud cheers.) If he were to quote the words of a venerable statesman he would say, "That is a question which is not ripe for discussion," (Laughter and renewed cheers.) When a Home Rule Parliament seemed to them to be inevitable they would tell them straight from the shoulder what reception it would get. (Hear, hear.) *Unconditional submission was no part of the Englishman's creed.* They had had their rebellions, and the English people had never accepted the doctrine of unconditional submission. They had rebelled against injustice, oppression, and arbitrary power. Well, the Irish Loyalists claimed to have the same sentiments as the English people. They had the same burning love of civil and religious liberty that they had. *If they had to choose between arbitrary oppression and an appeal for justice to the God of battles*, he had no more doubt than he had about his existence that that appeal would be made and that God would defend the right. (Loud cheers.) They would say in tones which could not be mistaken, "*Hands off*," whether those who assailed them were veiled rebels or an open foe or a statesman inebriated by the exuberance of his own verbosity. (Loud laughter.) They would be with Britain in saying "Hands off" to any man who proposed anything calculated to dim the glory, weaken the strength, or impair the unity of the Empire of their Sovereign lady the Queen. (Loud cheers.)

THE WORK OF THE LEAGUES.

Mr. Arnold Foster, in an article in the *Nineteenth Century*, of February, 1886, entitled "Shall we desert the Loyalists?" wrote:—

"If I could only help the public to realise, as I and all who have seen the thing face to face have realised, *the sordid details of these Land League crimes; if I could take them, step by step, through the whole process of intimidation, robbery, and murder; if I could show them who have been the victims, and who the organisers and perpetrators; if I could take them to the lonely cottages, where men and women, sick with fear, and knowing they were deserted have waited till they*

heard the Land League's messengers on the threshold ; then, I think, I should not have to plead as I do for the protection of honest men in Ireland. *If, for one hour, this base conspiracy could be stripped of the glamour of sham respectability* with which the falsehoods of its promoters and the ready gullibility of some Englishmen have invested it, I should cease to fear the triumph of the Land League. For the present, I fear there is no chance of this being done, and what I want the public to understand is that, in fact, at this very day, there is existing, within twenty-four hours' journey from London, a state of lawless and barbarous terrorism, brought about, if the late Prime Minister of England and five-sixths of his colleagues are to be believed, by the operation of the very men to whom it is proposed to hand over the government of Ireland "

THE TRUTH ABOUT COERCION.

Mr. Morley's excuse in 1886 for letting the National League work its will by merciless boycotting, by midnight outrage, and by dishonest repudiation of legal obligations, was that if the money subscribed did not "now go to the open purposes of the League, it would then go to the more execrable purpose of dynamite." A noble confession for a Minister of the Crown and a Minister of England to make! A greater incentive to the lawless and cruel coercion of the National League could not be conceived than that speech of Mr. John Morley. It is easy to imagine the chuckle with which such confessions of impotence on the part of the Queen's Government are hailed by every traitorous conspirator, by every village tyrant, and by every lawless blackmailer from Dublin to Kerry, and from Donegal to Wexford.

Mr. Morley, and those who like to delude themselves by cheap claptrap, raise a cuckoo cry against coercion, as if coercion was out of place to those who persistently and brutally defy the law. Coercion! There is a great deal of delusion about this word. What were the Irish people groaning under from 1880 to 1886, but coercion? It was coercion of the worst and most demoralising kind—coercion of the loyal by the disloyal, of the honest by the dishonest, of the law-abiding by the lawless ; in a word, of the best elements of society by the worst.

There was no freedom in Ireland then, there was tyranny of the most barbarous, selfish, and licentious kind—the tyranny of a band of harpies who had been allowed to fasten their yoke upon the neck of an ignorant and excitable peasantry. It was coercion, inspired by self-seeking, living upon social greed, fed with foreign money, upholding its base ascendency by outrage, murder, and by a dark and fiendish system of terror. It was coercion that was stamping out of a people, capable of great and generous development, every sentiment of honesty, order, and loyalty. It was coercion, whose agents spared neither the helplessness of women nor the innocence of children, nor the

harmlessness of the dumb creation. It was a coercion that persecuted and menaced the gallant daughters of a murdered Irish farmer, whose only crime was that they, with rare courage, helped their father to defend his homestead against armed assassins. It was coercion that cut off the ear and the cheek of a poor labouring man of seventy years of age, and turned him out, mutilated and helpless, to the bitter blasts of a winter night. It was coercion that held down an innocent and defenceless woman, who tried to defend her child from ill-usage, that her feet might be gnawed and torn by savage dogs. It was coercion that publicly mocked at the agony of a poor widow, whose husband had just been foully murdered. For such a coercion as this, we say to Mr. John Morley, and to all of his kidney, that one remedy alone is applicable—and that is the majesty of the law.

Every honest man in Great Britain would meet the foul and inhuman coercion of the National League by the just coercion of the law. Englishmen have so long enjoyed the priceless benefits of order and of equal justice, that there is danger lest they lose sight of the blessings which the reign of law has conferred upon all classes in England. If we look at epochs of past history, when the tyranny of a despot, or the no less destructive oppression of democratic anarchy prevailed, it will be found that all classes suffered bitterly, owing to the absence of law, and none so much as the poorest. If we look at countries where in our own time there is capricious injustice and widespread suffering, such as the anarchical republics of South America, or the blighting autocracy of St. Petersburg, or among the uncontrolled despotisms of Asia, it will be found that the main cause of all the wrong, discontent, and misery is the absence of a system of order and equal law. Before the law—which happily prevails in England and among the most civilised nations of the world—the rich and the poor have the same rights and the same verdict. For *the reign of law is a primary condition of civilisation.* Destroy the authority of the law and security, social confidence, the progress of trade, and national prosperity, are all overthrown.

Mr. Gladstone was not Mr. Gladstone as he was always, in word, at least, indifferent to the duty of Governments, and to the supremacy of the law. These are the words he used in Parliament in 1849, upon a debate on the Canadian rebellion :—

"When I speak of the honour of the Crown, I mean neither more nor less than a faithful discharge of the duties of Government, for the honour of the Crown consists in that; and one of the first duties of a government is that which appertains to the maintenance of public order, and which requires you to draw a clear line of distinction between those who rise up against the Government, and endeavour to overturn it by violence, and those who respect its laws, and who are ready to support it with their lives and substance. But if you obscure that line of

demarcation—if you allow the loyal man and the rebel to be confounded—if you pervert the principles of mercy, which makes punishment lenient, and erect them into a law against the principle of justice, which determines between right and wrong, then you sin against the honour of the Crown, and abandon the most sacred duties of a Government."

But support for any and every view and for all policies, however mutually antagonistic, can be found in Mr. Gladstone's speeches. He is a master of noble sentiments, the very Joseph Surface of politics. If the laws are not what we think they should be, they can be altered in a constitutional way. No one can say that there is any check upon political activity or agitation in this country, or any difficulty in making popular grievances widely and effectively known. Least of all can it be said that Irish grievances or Irish complaints fail to obtain a prompt hearing and ready redress.

Lord Hartington, in his statesmanlike and most impressive speech in the House of Commons on April 9th, 1886, made the following remarks upon the misuse of the term "coercion":—

"I cannot help thinking that the Prime Minister for the purpose of his argument has somewhat overstated the difficulties and the inefficiency and the impossibility of continuing to govern Ireland by the mingled system of remedial and repressive legislation. I do not admit that history, especially recent history, supports this argument. I appeal to the experience of his own Government, and I maintain that Lord Spencer by his administration, by the firm exercise of the powers conferred upon him by the Crimes Act, did to a great extend restore the operation of law, and the confidence in that operation of law. I believe that if that law, instead of terminating as it did at the close of the last session, had been a permanent Act, to be maintained as long as the necessity continued—(Opposition cheers and Home Rule laughter)—I do not think that we should have heard my right hon. friend yesterday declaring that the future government of Ireland on the same lines as in the past was an impossibility."

TAMPERING WITH REVOLUTION.

Mr. Gladstone made, in 1886, the remarkable admission that during the predominance of Liberal Ministeries since 1832, or, as he puts it, "during the fifty-three years since we advanced far in the career of Liberal principles and actions," coercion has greatly increased in Ireland. He showed by figures that in the thirty-two years from 1800 to 1832, when the Tory party was in the ascendency, that there were eleven years quite free from coercion against Ireland; but that in the fifty-three years from 1833 to 1885 there were only two years free from coercion. This seemed to the Prime Minister an amazing fact, though it is well known to the Conservative party that Irish disorder has always been the natural outcome of Liberal maladministration. For the Liberal theory of dealing with Ireland thus far has been first to tamper with revolution and lawlessness in the hopes of winning the Irish vote, and then, after the country has been plunged into crime and anarchy, to turn

round and repress with a most savage coercion what they had previously encouraged. Mr. Gladstone said that the coercion hitherto employed had been "spurious and ineffectual," and that, to be successful, it must be "maintained with a greater spirit, courage, and consistency than heretofore." This is strictly true as to the *enforcement* of the ordinary or the extraordinary laws for governing Ireland. Excessive powers of repression are not needed; it is the steady, resolute, and consistent administration by the Executive Government of those powers that is essential.

MR. BALFOUR'S CRIMES ACT OF 1887.

There has been more Radical misrepresentation regarding Mr. Balfour's Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Act of 1887 than any other part of the Government programme. It has been freely stated that the measure was not necessary, that it is unprecedented and oppressive in its character, and that it has been cruel and unfair in its operation. As a matter of fact, Mr. Balfour's Bill was far less drastic in its provisions than either of Mr. Gladstone's Acts of 1881 or 1882. It created no new offences, it was used most sparingly, and it was most effective in its results. Agrarian crime fell from 4,439 cases in 1881, and from 1,056 cases in 1886 when Lord Salisbury took office, to 472 in 1892. There were in June, 1892, on the eve of the General Election, only two persons in prison under its operation, and the Act of 1892 was then in force in only a very few districts of Ireland. Its result was to restore order and peace to Ireland—to extirpate the curse of boycotting—and to give safety and happiness to loyal and honest subjects of the Queen. No law-abiding or honest citizen ever suffered from its enactment. Only the mutilators, outrage mongers, boycotters, and assassins were punished under it.

PLAN OF CAMPAIGN LAUNCHED IN 1886.

The Plan of Campaign—that most daring and dishonest offshoot of the Irish agrarian agitation—had been launched in the autumn of 1886, and was in full swing. Meetings were being held throughout the country at which the most vehement incitements to disorder were delivered, followed by the natural crop of outrages and crime. The Nationalists had openly declared that it was their intention to make British Government in Ireland impossible, and to force the Government to pass the Crimes Act.

MR. JOHN REDMOND, M.P.,

at the Chicago Convention in August, 1886, spoke as follows:—

"The duty of the moment is clear. It now remains for us to prove, for the thousandth time, that as slaves we can be formidable foes. I assert here to-day

that the Government of Ireland by England is an impossibility, and I believe it to be our duty to make it so."

NECESSITY FOR THE CRIMES ACT OF 1887.

The condition of a great part of the South of Ireland when Mr. Balfour took up the reins of Government may be gathered from the charges delivered by the Judges at the Spring Assizes of 1887. On Feb. 28th Mr. Justice O'Brien, who had been raised to the bench by Mr. Gladstone in 1882, addressing the Grand Jury of County Clare, said :—

"All these returns which I have before me, and the information which has reached me, from other quarters of an unquestionably authentic character, lead me to the conclusion that *law, to a great extent, has ceased to exist* in this county."—(*Freeman's Journal*, March 1, 1887.)

And on the 10th of March the same Judge addressed the Grand Jury of county Kerry, as follows :—

"These returns present a picture of the county of Kerry such as could hardly be round in any country that has passed the confines of natural society, and entered on the duties and relations and acknowledged obligations of civilized life. The law is defeated—perhaps I should rather say has ceased to exist—houses are attacked by night and by day, even the midnight terror yielding to the noonday audacity of crime; person and life are assailed; terrified inmates are wholly unable to do anything to protect themselves, and *a state of terror and lawlessness prevails everywhere.*"—*Freeman's Journal*, March 11, 1887.

Similarly, on the 14th March, 1887, Mr. Justice Johnson, who had been Attorney-General for Ireland under Mr. Gladstone's Government, and had been raised to the bench by him, in his charge to the County Cork Grand Jury, said :—

"The returns from this and the West Riding—and they cover a period of only three months since the last Winter Assizes—show that in a considerable portion of this great country the people who live in remote and isolated districts are subject to *violence, alarm, and plunder, by day and by night*—principally by night—from gangs of armed men, disguised mainly, who rove through the country seizing arms, plundering property, always with a show of violence, often accompanied with threats, and *sometimes with assaults of the meanest and most dastardly character.*"—*Daily Express*, March 15, 1887.

FAILURE OF THE ORDINARY LAW.

The attempt to cope with this state of things by means of the ordinary law had completely failed. Witnesses were afraid to give evidence, and people who had been assailed by moonlighters, and who had given evidence to the police in the heat of the moment, turned away when confronted with their assailants, and refused to identify them. Nor was this to be wondered at when they saw the persecution which followed persons like the

Curtins, and Norah Fitzmaurice,* whose only offence was that they gave evidence which brought their fathers' murderers to justice. Even if evidence were forthcoming, *jurors were afraid to convict*. Men who did their duty according to their oaths were held up to popular execration and were boycotted, and both the Limerick and Clare Assizes in March, 1887, were adjourned by the presiding judges owing to verdicts of acquittal in cases where the guilt of the accused had been proved to demonstration.

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN'S TESTIMONY.

In October, 1885, only a few months after he had ceased to be Chief Secretary for Ireland, had attacked the Conservative Government, in a speech addressed to the Scottish Liberal Association at Perth, for attempting to carry on the government of Ireland with the ordinary criminal law procedure, he said:—

"But the key of the whole of this question was this—that in many parts of Ireland, for certain classes of offences, especially offences of an agrarian character, they could not trust to the ordinary class of jurymen doing their duty, partly from ignorance, partly from prejudice, but mainly owing to the cruel and overpowering system of terror under the National League. They could not be sure with the clearest evidence of being able to get a verdict. Now he maintained that, *in order to uphold the arm of justice in Ireland, it was not merely reasonable, but necessary, to provide some measures which could overcome that difficulty, and it might very well have been made part of the permanent law.*"

After describing the state of terrorism existing in Ireland, he said:—

"All I thought was wanting was that we should provide mean by which there could be secured, easily and equitably, and without injury to anyone, a fair and impartial trial for certain kinds of offences, in the trial of which *you cannot depend upon the ordinary Irish juryman doing his duty. I mean by a fair trial, a trial fair not only to the man charged, but to the victim of the offence, and to the*

---

* Mr. Curtin, it will be remembered, was a well to do farmer in Kerry, whose house was visited one night by moonlighters. He and his family resisted them, and Mr. Curtin was shot. His daughters identified two of their assailants, and secured their conviction. Mrs. Curtin and her afmily, who had previously been on good terms with all their neighbours, were thereupon completely boycotted. They could not go out or even attend their place of worship without being hooted and insulted. They were obliged to have a police protection hut at their door, and the persecution to which they were subjected was such that they were at last compelled to sell their farm and leave the country.

The case of Norah Fitzmaurice was precisely similar. Her father was shot before her eyes on the public road. She identified and secured the conviction of his murderers, for which offence she was cruelly boycotted, and obliged to be protected by police. Her sad story, told by herself, is to be found in the evidence taken before the Special Commission.

community which is injured by the commission of the offence. Without this the arm of justice must be paralysed, unnerved, and I am much mistaken if that is not the case at the present day."—*Scotsman*, October 24th, 1885.

Mr. Gladstone himself stated, in the speech in which he introduced the Home Rule Bill of 1886, that it was impossible to depend in Ireland upon the finding of a jury in a case of agrarian crime.

THE CRIMINAL LAW AND PROCEDURE ACT, 1887.

Under such circumstances the Government had no alternative but to ask Parliament to add to the effective force of the law such provisions as would enable the Executive to bring guilty persons to justice. Accordingly they introduced and carried through Parliament the Criminal Law and Procedure Act of 1887. This Act did not, as has been so constantly asserted, make anything an offence which was not one before, but simply introduced some changes in procedure. With two exceptions, its provisions are substantially taken from Mr. Gladstone's Crimes Act of 1882, while it did not re-enact the severer portions of that Act or of Mr. Gladstone's Crimes Act of 1881.

The Criminal Law and Procedure Act of 1887 provides (section 1) for a preliminary inquiry upon oath where a crime has been committed, although no person has been charged with the commission thereof (compare section 16 of the Crimes Act of 1882); this being one of the provisions specially advocated by Mr. Campbell-Bannerman, in the speech at Perth, which has been already referred to.

A similar provision exists in Scotland as part of the ordinary criminal procedure; but when put into force in Ireland it was described by the Nationalists as the "Star-chamber" clause.

Section 2 provides for the trial before a court of summary jurisdiction of any person committing any of the following offences in a proclaimed district:—

(a) Taking part in any criminal conspiracy *already punishable by law.*

(b) Using violence or intimidation to any person, either to make him do that which he has a right to abstain from doing, or to abstain from doing that which he has a right to do.

(c) Taking part in any riot or unlawful assembly.

(d) Taking forcible possession of a house or land within twelve months after execution of a writ of possession thereof.

(e) Assaulting or obstructing officers of the law in the execution of their duty.

(f) Inciting any person to commit any of the above offences.

All these provisions, with the exception of (*a*), are practically identical with those contained in sections 7 and 8 of Mr. Gladstone's Crimes Act of 1882; and the sole object of this section is to secure a fair trial in these cases. (See Mr. Campbell-Bannerman's speech at Stirling, already quoted.)

The remaining sections contain provisions for *trial by special jury, change of venue, the proclamation of certain districts* for the purposes of the Act, and for the proclamation by the Lord Lieutenant of any association as being dangerous, if he is satisfied that it is formed for the commission of or for encouraging crimes, promoting or inciting to acts of violence or intimidation, or interfering with the administration of the law (compare sections 4, 6, 9, 23, and 34, Crimes Act, 1882).

The *punishment* under the Act of 1887 *is limited to six months' imprisonment; and the widest powers of appeal* are open to anyone convicted under it.

MR. GLADSTONE INTENDED THE SAME PLAN.

We have it on the authority of Sir George Trevelyan, M.P., who was Chief Secretary for Ireland under Lord Spencer, that, in the summer of 1885, *it was the intention of Mr. Gladstone's Government (of which Sir George Trevelyan was then a member)* had they remained in office, to have passed *a precisely similar measure* to this Act, for which a Conservative Government has been so abused. Speaking to his Scotch constituents in May, 1886, he said:—

"In last June, Mr. Gladstone and his Cabinet determined to maintain the law in Ireland. They resolved to have a *preliminary investigation on oath into undetected crime, which you have in Scotland.* They resolved to have power of changing the scene of a trial from a locality where public feeling was too strong for that trial to be a fair one, a power which you have in Scotland. They resolved to call *a special jury in cases of crime*, as a substitute for the far more potent and effective system of convicting or acquitting by a majority of jurors, which you have in Scotland. They resolved to *allow a summary sentence of a few months to be inflicted for crimes of violence and intimidation by two stipendiary* magistrates, who answer in essential respects to your Scotch sheriffs. That is coercion! That is the system, *greatly effective as a check on crime, but absolutely without any terror or danger to law-abiding citizens.*'—Mr. Trevelyan at Galashiels, *The Times*, May 8th, 1886.

THE CRIMES ACT OF 1882.

The Criminal Law and Procedure Act, of 1887 did not re-enact the severer portions of Mr. Gladstone's Act of 1882, such as the provisions giving power—

(*a*) To try cases of treason, murder, arson, attacks on dwelling-houses, &c., without a jury, by a Special Commission of three Judges (Prevention of Crime Act, 1882, sections 1—3);

(*b*) To any constable to arrest any person in a proclaimed district out of his place of abode at any time after one hour later than sunset and before sunrise, under circumstances giving rise to a reasonable suspicion of a criminal intent (section 11); the person arrested being liable to three months' imprisonment (section 11);

(*c*) To a constable to arrest any stranger found in a proclaimed district, under circumstances giving rise to a reasonable suspicion of a criminal intent, and to bring him before a Justice of the Peace, who might require him to give security, and in default commit him to prison for one month (section 12);

(*d*) And to the Lord Lieutenant to seize any newspaper (section 13).

The Criminal Law and Procedure Act of 1887 became law on the 19th of July, and the first question which the Government had to decide was, whether or not the National League, which had been allowed to spring up under Mr. Gladstone's administration, after the suppression of the Land League, and which had been described by Sir William Harcourt as the "apostolic successor" of *that body, should be proclaimed as a 'dangerous association.'* Mr. Parnell had warned the Government on the introduction of the Act that "coercion" had been answered in former times by "dynamite, and by fresh attempts at assassination and conspiracy."

The real question at issue, however, was which was to be supreme in Ireland, the Government or the National League.

PROCLAMATION OF THE NATIONAL LEAGUE.

On the 19th of August 1887, the *Government* threw down the gage, and *proclaimed the National League as a "dangerous association."* Mr. John Morley revoked that proclamation in September, 1892. Mr. Balfour's proclamation was received by the Nationalists with a howl of derision, but Mr. Balfour went quietly to work, disregarding the clamour which was raised both in Ireland and England. The Irish Nationalist Members had declared that under the "Crimes" Act the gaols would be filled to overflowing.

Mr. W. O'Brien, M.P., speaking at the Rotunda, in Dublin, on October 10th, 1887, said:—

"I tell him" (Mr. Balfour) "candidly here to-night that the fixed resolve of all the millions of men and women is to defy this infamous and abominable Act, and to thwart and obstruct it in every possible way."—*Freeman's Journal*, October 11th, 1887.

The *Kerry Sentinel*, the organ of Mr. E. Harrington, M.P., declared, in a leading article dated March 1st, 1887, that—

"*The jails will be crammed*, and the Coercion Act must soon die out, a victim to its own rapacity."

And the *Weekly News*, edited by Mr. T. D. Sullivan, M.P., in a leading article, on April 9th, 1887, wrote as follows:—

"It only needs, therefore, that seven or eight hundred men shall be immured, to

render Mr. Balfour's Bill less valuable than the paper on which it is printed. He can imprison no more than the prisons can hold, and those who are outside then can snap their fingers at his best or worst."

SMALL AMOUNT OF COERCION.

In view of these declarations it is interesting to note what a *small amount of so-called coercion* has actually taken place, and what excellent results it has produced.

The total number of persons proceeded against under the Criminal Law and Procedure Act, from the date of its passing to the 31st of March, 1892, *was* 3,775, of whom 1,047 were discharged, and 2,728 convicted. In 671 cases the defendants were ordered to find sureties or enter into recognizances for their good behaviour, and the number of individuals who have been imprisoned under the Act to the 31st of March, 1892, *is only* 1884. *The highest penalty which can be inflicted under the Act is six months' imprisonment,* and *only* 181 *persons have been sentenced to more than three months' imprisonment,* while 1,099, or considerably more than half the total number imprisoned, were sentenced for *terms not exceeding one month.*

The number of persons who were imprisoned twice was 88, among them being *Mr. John Dillon, M.P., who spent his time on each occasion in hospital.* Fifteen were imprisoned three times, and only two four times—namely, Mr. William O'Brien, M.P., and Mr. O'Sullivan, a Town Councillor of Galway, and an ardent Parnellite.

The *total number* of persons in prison under the Act on the *1st of May,* 1892, *was six,* and in June, 1892, only *two* persons.

APPEALS.

There were 565 *appeals* against decisions under the Act, with the result *that* 344 *decisions were affirmed,* 80 *reversed, and in* 141 *cases the sentence was reduced.*

ONE THOUSAND PERSONS IMPRISONED WITHOUT TRIAL BY MR. GLADSTONE.

It must be remembered that under the Criminal Law and Procedure Act of 1887 no one can be imprisoned without a fair trial in open Court, whereas, under Mr. Gladstone's Crimes Act of 1881, his *Government arrested and imprisoned over one thousand persons as "suspects,"* without any trial whatever.

The number of prosecutions under the Act of 1887 steadily diminished each year. Thus the number of prosecutions in 1888 was 1475; in 1889, 839; in 1890, 531; and in 1891, 243; but though the Act became by 1892 in practice almost a dead letter, the effect which it produced was eminently satisfactory.

DIMINUTION IN NUMBER OF AGRARIAN OUTRAGES.

The number of agrarian outrages diminished from 1,056 in 1886, to 455 in 1891, or less than in any year since 1878.

The following table, compiled from the Government Returns, shows the number of agrarian outrages in each year since 1880:

NUMBER OF AGRARIAN OUTRAGES.

Year.	Number of Outrages.	
1880	2,585	Under Mr. Gladstone's Government.
1881	4,439	
1882	3,433	
1883	870	
1884	762	
1885	944	Change of Government in each year.
1886	1,056	
1887	883	Under the Unionist Government.
1888	660	
1889	534	
1890	519	
1891	472	
1892	455	

It will be observed that the number of agrarian crimes, which in 1881 and 1882 reached the enormous totals of 4,439 and 3,433, largely diminished as the result of the Crimes Acts passed in each of those years, but that *on the Crimes Act of* 1882 *being allowed to lapse in* 1885, *the number of agrarian outrages immediately began to rise*, until it was again checked by the Act of 1887.

DECREASE OF BOYCOTTING.

On the 30th of June, 1887, immediately before the Criminal Law and Procedure Act became law, no less than 4,901 persons were boycotted. On the 31st of December, 1890, the number had been reduced to 472, since which date *boycotting has practically died out.* The number of persons relieved from the intolerable tyranny of boycotting is therefore more than double the number of persons who have been imprisoned under the so-called "Coercion" Act.

The improved state of the country enabled the Government in June, 1891, to suspend the operations of those portions of the Criminal Law and Procedure Act which conferred on the magis-

trates summary jurisdiction as regards criminal conspiracy, using violence, or intimidation (those being the portions chiefly objected to as "coercion"), over the whole of Ireland *except in the County Clare, and three baronies in Galway, one in Donegal, and one in Tipperary. In April,* 1892, *these five baronies were also exempted.*

REDUCTION OF POLICE FORCE.

It was also possible largely to reduce the number of police, the actual strength of the Royal Irish Constabulary on the 1st of May, 1892, being between 300 and 400 less than on the 1st of May, 1886. The average number of Irish police in the five financial years of Mr. Gladstone's Government, 1881–2 to 1885–6, was 14,602, and in the five financial years of the Unionist Government, 1886–7 to 1890–1, 13,948, the average annual cost of the force in the latter period being £1,094 less than in the former.

The number of evictions decreased from 3,781 *in* 1886, *to* 799 *in* 1891. The following table, compiled from the Government Returns, shows the total number of evictions during each year, from 1882 to 1891:

Year.	Total Number of Evictions.
1882	5,201
1883	3,643
1884	4,188
1885	3,127
1886	3,781
1887	3,869
1888	1,609
1889	1,805
1890	1,842
1891	799

The increase in the number of evictions in 1887, as compared with the previous year was caused by the inauguration of the Plan of Campaign in the autumn of the latter year, to which a large number of the evictions in the following years is also to be attributed.

This dishonest conspiracy completely collapsed before July, 1892. It had involved the ruin of a large number of tenants who were duped into adopting it by promises which have not been fulfilled. Many of them have seen their farms taken by others, as has been the case on Lord Massereene's Estate in Louth, on the Brooke Estate at Coolgreany, county Wexford, and on Lord Lansdowne's estate at Luggacurren, in Queen's County, where the new tenants have purchased their farms under the Ashbourne Act. On some estates, such as that belonging to The O'Grady in the county Limerick, the tenants of which were among the first to adopt the Plan of Campaign, the evicted lands have been successfully worked by or on behalf of the landlord. On others, the tenants, finding themselves left in the lurch, have come to terms with their former landlords, in most cases on the basis of purchase. Thus, a large number of the evicted tenants on the Ponsonby Estate, county Cork, have availed themselves of the facilities for that purpose offered by the Land Act of 1891, and have entered into agreements for the purchase of their former holdings. But though such of the Campaigners as have succeeded in returning to their farms may be far happier than their brethren who have no prospect of ever getting back to theirs, it is doubtful whether they will ever recover the losses they have suffered through having adopted the disastrous "Plan of Campaign."

Perhaps the greatest fiasco of all in connection with the Land Agitation was that of "New Tipperary," which will hereafter be known to history only as an example of the folly and incompetence of those who aspire to be the rulers of Ireland.

MR. JUSTICE O'BRIEN AT CORK, 1892.

The peaceful state of the country in 1892 was testified to by the charges delivered by the Judges at the Spring Assizes of 1892. Mr. Justice O'Brien's description of the condition of things five years ago has been already quoted, and his remarks in opening the county Cork Assizes in March, 1892, may be referred to as showing the difference between the two periods:—

Addressing the Grand Jury, he said—"He was very much pleased indeed to be able to state, upon the information supplied to him, that, notwithstanding some trifling and inconsiderable efforts to fan the expiring flame of disorder, *the county was in a most satisfactory condition*. The flood of crime that for so many years had passed over it, in common with other counties, had entirely gone down. The West Riding—that part of this county which might be supposed to suffer most from difficulty and distress—exhibited an extraordinary diminution of crime—no less than two-thirds. The offences reported for the corresponding period last year were 94, while for the present period they amounted to *but* 31. *All trace of any kind of offences indicating a state of disorder or agrarian disturbance was entirely wanting*.

Some of the most mischievous and injurious features that distinguished the state of things in this county had ceased altogether. One alone deserved particular notice. *Boycotting was at an end*, and the attention of the people generally was found to be turned to questions that affected their material prosperity."—(*The Times*, March 16, 1892.)

LIST OF IRISH COERCION ACTS.

Date.	Acts.	Ministry.
1830	Importation of Arms Act	*Cons.*
1831	Whiteboy Act	*Lib.*
1831	Arms Act	,,
1833	Suppression of Disturbances (Lord Grey's Act	,,
1833	Change of Venue Act	,,
1834	Suppression of Disturbances Act (Continuance)	,,
1835	Public Peace Act, 5 ys.	,,
1836	Importation of Arms Act	,,
1838	Ditto (Continuance) ...	,,
1839	Unlawful Oaths Act ...	,,
1840	Importation of Arms Act (Continuance)	,,
1841	Houghing of Cattle Act	,,
1841	Importation of Arms Act (Continuance)	,,
1843	Ditto (Amendment) ...	*Cons.*
1844-5	Unlawful Oaths Act (Continuance and Amendment)	,,
1846	Constabulary Force Act	*Lib.*
1847	Crime and Outrage Act	,,
1848	Treason Amendment Act	,,
1848	Removal of Aliens Act	,,
1848	Habeas Corpus Suspension Act	,,
1848	Unlawful Oaths Act (Continuance)	,,
1849	Habeas Corpus Suspension Act	,,
1850	Crimes and Outrage Act (Continuance)...	,,
1851	Unlawful Oaths Act (Continuance)	,,
1852	Crime and Outrage Act (Continuance)	*Cons.*
1853	Ditto	*Lib.*
1854	Ditto	,,
1855	Ditto	,,
1856	Peace Preservation Act	,,
1856	Unlawful Oaths Act (Continuance)	,,
1858	Peace Preservation Act (Continuance)	*Cons.*
1860	Ditto	*Lib.*
1862	Ditto	,,
1862	Unlawful Oaths Act (Continuance)	,,
1865	Peace Preservation Act (Continuance)	,,
1865	Habeas Corpus Suspension Act	,,
1866	Ditto (Continuance) ...	*Cons.*
1867	Ditto ditto	,,
1867	Ditto ditto	,,
1868	Ditto ditto	,,
1870	Peace Preservation Act	*Lib.*
1871	Protection of Life and Property (Westmeath Act)	,,
1873	Peace Preservation Act, &c. (Continuance) ...	,,
1875	Ditto ditto ...	*Cons.*
1881	Protection of Life and Property Act	*Lib.*
1881	Arms Act	,,
1882	Crimes Prevention Act	,,
1887	Criminal Law Procedure Act	*Cons.*

That is, there have been, since 1830, 38 Liberal and only 11 Conservative. Of these 11 nine have been merely the continuance of Liberal Coercion Acts already in force. By the separate Irish Parliament, known as Grattan's Parliament, from 1782 to 1800, there were no less than 54 Coercion Acts passed.

MR. GLADSTONE'S RECORD OF UNBROKEN FAILURE.

When Mr. Gladstone asks this country to follow him in his latest and wildest experiment as to Ireland, it is right to pause and to ask what credentials he brings from the past for the confidence of his countrymen. And here Mr. Morley may be reminded that his slipshod generalisation as to all British Government in Ireland having been an hopeless failure, is a very easy way of getting rid of historical facts. It is not true to say that what Mr. Morley calls coercion, but what we call vindication of the law, has been a failure in Ireland. The reverse is the case. Whenever the law has been firmly and steadily asserted and upheld, then peace and prosperity have prevailed in that country. From 1850, down to 1866, Ireland made regular and remarkable progress. It was not till Mr. Gladstone discovered his upas tree, and commenced his onslaughts on English supremacy. that the downward course was begun. Again, from 1874 till 1880, under Lord Beaconsfield's resolute administration, the descent towards anarchy was completely checked. After, however, Mr. Gladstone's nerveless and anarchising hand took possession of the helm of state in 1880, Irish affairs went steadily backwards. From 1886 to 1892 under the firm administration of Lord Salisbury, crime was again dispelled, and peace and prosperity reigned. The real danger is in England, not in Ireland. The arch enemy of order and Imperial union is not so much the Nationalist Party as Mr. Gladstone. Ireland had been rapidly improving in 1866, when Mr. Gladstone began to turn the Chapel Bell into a dominant political force. The old race hatred was dying out and order and prosperity went hand in hand.

The record of Mr. Gladstone and of his party in their dealings with Ireland has been a record of universal, unbroken failure. In 1868 Mr Gladstone made the overthrow of British ascendency in Ireland his basis, and the keystone of his future policy. He laid his destructive axe at "the upas tree of British ascendency." The Prime Minister of England, bound by every consideration of honour, duty, and patriotism to uphold and strengthen the civilising and beneficent influence of his country, deliberately undertook to destroy British ascendency in Ireland. Fatally has he succeeded. The Church, the rights of the loyal landowners, the principles of economy, the majesty of the law, the peace of the realm have all been sacrificed to this perverse and injurious policy. Now the end has come. He now wishes to make the last

and most desperate sacrifice of all to the insatiable demands of the Irish revolution. Mr. Gladstone is prepared to abandon the security of the United Kingdom, the union and strength of the Empire, and capitulate before the menaces of a sordid conspiracy.

Each blow aimed by Mr. Gladstone's fatal axe at British ascendency in Ireland has brought to the ground a goodly prop of civilisation and progress. He has felled what he stigmatised as the upas tree of British power and influence—the Protestant Church, the influence of loyal proprietors of British blood, the majesty of the law. These he has, indeed, destroyed, and what did he set up in their place? As foul and dark a upas tree as ever tyrant or demagogue constructed—the upas tree of brutal crime, of soul-crushing terror, of social hate, of widespread dishonesty, and of national demoralisation.

This was Mr. Gladstone's handiwork, and for all this he is directly responsible. *Every prediction he made has been falsified; every promise he lavished has been broken; lawlessness instead of order*, violence instead of peace, hatred and sedition instead of prosperity and content have been the direct outcome of his legislation and his policy.

In 1868 the loyal and Protestant Church of Ireland was the first to be flung to the wolves of revolution. The only effect was to bring them on with whetted appetite. In 1870 the land was attacked; but the first attempt at agrarian legislation only produced the Fenian conspiracy and Mr. Gladstone's severe Coercion Bill of 1871. Lord Beaconsfield's firm and benign Administration from 1874 to 1880 cast some rays of sunshine over the distressful politics of Ireland. He, indeed, lightened the repressive powers that Mr. Gladstone had taken in 1871; and yet under Lord Beaconsfield Ireland enjoyed the maximum of peace and order with the minimum of coercion and the minimum of crime. With Mr. Gladstone's resumption of office in 1880 there burst forth afresh that chronic crop of crime and menace, the inevitable and fatal product of the dragon's teeth, which Mr. Gladstone's policy of alternate weakness and coercion has always sown in the receptive soil of Ireland. In 1881, without any compensation whatever, 25 per cent. was taken off the property of the loyal landowners of Ireland and given to Mr. Parnell's disloyal followers. This was done by a Minister, who, in his youth, had demanded and obtained the amplest compensation for the enfranchisement of his father's slaves. Two drastic Coercion Bills marked this third phase of Mr. Gladstone's attack upon British ascendancy.

Before the General Election of 1885 Mr. Gladstone painted in graphic language the danger to England and to the Liberal

party if Mr. Parnell should hold the balance of power in the new Parliament.

Mr. Gladstone, in his first Midlothian speech in November, 1885, said :—

"Now, gentlemen, I tell you seriously and solemnly that, though I believe the Liberal party to be honourable, patriotic, and trustworthy, in such a position as that it would not be safe for it to enter on the consideration of a measure in respect to which, at the first step of its progress, it would be in the power of a party coming from Ireland to say, 'Unless you do this and unless you do that we will turn you out to-morrow.'"

What he then dreaded came to pass. The result of that election was to give Mr. Parnell the balance of power which Mr. Gladstone deprecated. How, under the circumstances, did the Prime Minister act? Instead of facing the danger and repudiating and resisting the disloyal and injurious schemes whose influence he clearly anticipated, Mr. Gladstone at once capitulated to Mr. Parnell, and he tried to purchase a brief and discreditable lease of power by placing Ireland and Great Britain at the mercy of a band of men whom he himself had described as "marching "through rapine to the disintegration of the Empire."

BLACKMAIL TO LAW BREAKERS.

Mr. Gladstone's failure has been due to his persistent negation of economic laws, and of political common sense. Cowardly concession on the part of a Government to lawless agitation and to criminal violence has never purchased peace, and never will. Mr. Gladstone has confessed that the Fenian outrages of 1866 and 1867 were the "motor muscle" of his Irish policy. Mr. Parnell accepted the lesson, and formally promised to profit by the confession. The conspirators have thoroughly mastered the character of their tool, and have improved upon their knowledge. Their agitation has paid, and is paying too well for them to abandon it. So long as agitation was profitable, so long did it continue. The backbone of the Irish agitation is unpunished outrage and crime. Till the supremacy of the law be vindicated, firmly and constantly, the revolution, fed on agrarian crime and nurtured by the pusillanimous concessions of Ministers, develops and flourishes. Mr. Gladstone has repeated the old fatal policy of the Danegelt. In the tenth century England had a king, Ethelred the Unready. When the Danes harassed his kingdom, instead of manfully resisting their invasion, he offered them a sum of money, in order to purchase a temporary peace. Mr. Gladstone in 1868 gave to the Irish revolutionaries the sop of the Irish Church. The Danes came upon Ethelred the next year in greater force. Again the craven monarch bribed them off, this time with a larger sum of money. Just so Irish agitation was inflamed by

the sacrifice of the loyal and Protestant Church in 1868, and Mr. Gladstone tried his second bribe—the Land Act of 1870. The Danes came a third time against Ethelred, and, in order to buy them off, he was compelled to drain his kingdom of its resources. Mr. Gladstone, confronted in 1880 and 1881 by a fiercer and more formidable outbreak of lawless agitation, made his "supreme effort" of concession, cast political economy to Jupiter and Saturn, and assigned to the enemy 25 per cent. of the property of the loyal landowners of Ireland. This surrender was to give Ireland content and peace. Fond delusion! The Danes returned, flushed with success, and furnished by the English tribute with the sinews of war, and in this last invasion took from the wretched Ethelred his kingdom, and from his people their independence. So now the Irish Revolutionists triumphantly demand from Mr. Gladstone not merely the sacrifice of a Church the property of landowning Loyalists, and the principles of political economy, but the very existence of the United Kingdom. The union of the three peoples, the continued integrity of the British Empire, the very principle and keystone on which our national and Imperial strength and greatness rest, are now being offered to the ever-swelling demands of the revolutionary horseleech. It rests now with the British people to decide their own fate. They can at this tremendous crisis make the parallel complete, by following Mr. Gladstone, and by placing their national power at the mercy of the Nationalist leaders and their Irish-American instigators, or they can take the better and the safer course, follow the warnings of the best men of all parties, and brace up their nerves and their resolution for a final contest with the forces of anarchy and disintegration. Thus and thus only will England, Scotland, and Ireland enjoy real peace, union, and well-being, so long as courage and firmness guide the counsels of the State.

CONTEMPT FOR ECONOMIC LAWS.

Besides the political folly of paying blackmail to lawbreakers, there has been the grievous contempt for the elementary and essential laws of political economy. It is easy for politicians to devise excuses, and very specious ones, for State interference with those eternal rules which regulate the conditions of free society, and the material development of a country. The law of supply and demand is an inexorable taskmaster, and in the long run finds out and overcomes those who try to evade, cheat, or overbear its operation. It is pitiable, and perhaps comical too, to read Mr. Gladstone's speeches upon the Land Act of 1881, by the light of his speeches and views expressed in 1870 upon his Land Act of that year. The principles of the Prime Minister in 1870 and 1881—if the word principle is in any sense

applicable to his sophistical and fickle rhetoric—were directly opposed to, and contradictory of, each other. The Land Act of 1881 was based on "fixed" or "fair rents," "free sale" and "fixity of tenure." These were the very theories which in 1870 Mr. Gladstone denounced with the most unbounded vigour. Nor can his arguments of 1870 be effectually answered by anything he said in defence of the Land Act of 1881. Indeed, he practically gave up reason and fact, when he "cast political economy to Jupiter and Saturn." A few of his opinions upon fixity of tenure and free sale are quoted below. Speaking on the Irish Land Bill in 1870, Mr. Gladstone said upon the subject of "fair rents:"—

"If I could conceive a plan more calculated than anything else, first of all, for throwing into confusion the whole economical arrangements of the country; secondly, for driving out of the field all solvent and honest men who might be bidders for farms, and might desire to carry on the honourable business of agriculture; thirdly, for carrying widespread demoralisation throughout the whole mass of the Irish people; I must say, as at present advised, to confine myself to the present, and, until further convinced, it is this plan and this demand that we should embody in our Bill, as a part of permanent legislation, a provision by which men shall be told that there shall be an authority always existing ready to release them from the contracts they have deliberately entered into.

"It is said that there ought to be a power to reduce excessive rents . . . I own I have not heard, I do not know, and I cannot conceive what is to be said for the prospective power to reduce excessive rents. In whose interest is it asked? Certainly not in the interest of the landlord? Is it asked in the interest of the tenant? Shall I really be told that it is for the interest of the Irish tenant bidding for a farm that the law should say to him—'Cast aside all providence and forethought, go into the market and bid what you like, drive out of the field the prudent man who means to fulfil his engagements; bid right above him, and induce the landlord to give you the farm, and the moment you have got it come forward, go to the public authority, show that the rent is excessive, and that you cannot pay it, and get it reduced!"

And again upon the subject of "fixity of tenure" Mr. Gladstone was in 1870 equally emphatic:—

"I ask the House whether, during these four nights in this great arena of reason and discussion, any argument whatever has been made by any English, Scotch, or Irish representative to show that fixity of tenure, to be applied as a means of securing justice and peace in Ireland, can for a moment abide its trial at the bar of reason.

"We must endeavour to make reason reach the ears and the minds of the Irish people. Perpetuity of tenure is a phrase that I flatter myself is a little going out of the fashion. If I have contributed anything towards disparaging it, I am not sorry.

"*My proposition is that if you value rents you may as well, for every available purpose, adopt perpetuity of tenure at once.* It is perpetuity of tenure only in a certain disguise. It is the first link in the chain, but it drags after it the last.

"However, what I do wish is, in the first place, that there should be a clear manifestation of the views of the Government; and, secondly, of the House, that we are not ready to accede to a principle of legislation by which the State shall take into its own hands the valuation of rents throughout Ireland. I say, take into its own hands because it is perfectly immaterial whether the thing shall be done by

a State officer forming part of the Civil Service, or by an arbitrator acting under State authority, or by any other person invested by the law with powers to determine on what terms as to rent every holding in Ireland shall be held. If you are to value rents, you must take into your hands the fixing of every other condition of agricultural holdings because otherwise in vain do you fix rents."

These were accurate principles, clearly laid down, and quite unanswerable. Yet, eleven years later, in 1881, Mr. Gladstone swallowed the whole of these deliberate opinions, and, in his Land Act of 1881, embodied and crystallised the very faults which he so indignantly repudiated in 1870. Of course, the Land Act of 1881 was a failure. It irritated all classes and satisfied none. The value of land has fallen. The landowners are well-nigh ruined. The land itself was bound to be worse rack-rented than ever before under the joint operation of fixed rent and free sale. The effect of his legislation of 1881 was exactly as Mr. Gladstone predicted in 1870 such blundering would result. It "cast aside all prudence and forethought." It "threw all the economical arrangements of the country into confusion." It "drove honest men" out of Ireland. It most undoubtedly, "carried widespread demoralisation throughout the whole mass of the Irish people." The deterioration of Mr. Gladstone as a politician has been most painful. Ten years ago he would have scouted as the last insult, the bare suspicion that he could ever descend to introduce his Separatist Bill or even his Land Act of 1881. His political degeneracy may be well gauged by the quality of his supporters. *Quantum mutatus ab illo Hectore!*

PROMISES FALSIFIED.

It is instructive to recall some of the promises so freely distributed and the anticipations so fondly indulged in by Mr. Gladstone with regard to his Irish measures. He has always predicted a Utopia of peace and well-being as the outcome of each of his blows at the "Upas tree of British ascendency." The exact reverse of these pledges and hopes has in every case come about. Ireland has rapidly gone from bad to worse under the impulse of Mr. Gladstone's fantastic legislation and revoluionary changes. Disaffection and disorder reached such a pitch that nothing will satisfy the Nationalist party but separation. By the result of his past policy, and, by its universal failure, the fruits of the new and most fatal surrender can best be judged. In itself his scheme is objectionable enough. It bristles with causes of dispute and peril. It was bound to unsettle everything, and it can settle nothing. It would end in separation or civil war, and therefore in the enfeeblement of British power. If there are any who are still disposed to blindly trust Mr. Gladstone's quack nostrums, and who are still sanguine enough to

expect some vague solution of the Irish problem from his Home Rule scheme let them be convinced by a perusal of the absolute failure and collapse of all Mr. Gladstone's past promises and hopes. The success of his Plan is based on even more illusory grounds than his confidence and bright expectations of 1868, 1870, and 1881.

MR. GLADSTONE'S HOPES FROM THE LAND BILL OF 1870.

"What I hope is, that having witnessed the disaster and difficulty which have arisen from this long procrastination, we shall resolve in mind and heart by *a manifold effort to close and seal up for ever*, if it may be, *this great question which so intimately concerns the welfare and happiness of the people of Ireland.* Our desire is, that when it has received the sanction of the Legistature it may become a great gift to Ireland, and may put an end to the grievances and sufferings which have so long accompanied the tenure of land in that country. We found it necessary to propose a Bill which in our judgment should be adequate. And if again I am asked what I hope to effect by this Bill, I certainly hope we shall effect a great change in Ireland; but I hope also—and confidently believe—that this change will be accomplished by gentle means."—Mr. W. E. Gladstone, February 15th, 1870. "Hansard," cxcix., 335, 382-3, 386.

"We, who think that a reasonable Bill on the subject of the Irish land laws may attain its object, are justified in hoping and expecting, if we meet the reasonable demands of the Irish people, that their aspirations will fall down to the level and standard of justice, and that the establishment of good laws will produce that sense of security on the part of tenants, and that disposition to invest capital in land which will make the land in Ireland not merely worth twenty or twenty-five years purchase, but will raise it altogether to, or very nearly to, the value of land in England or Scotland."—Mr. W. E. Gladstone, April 4th, 1870. "Hansard," cc., 1,263.

"We have presented a Bill to the House after an amount of labour on our own part such as in the course of a long political life I had never known bestowed on the preparation of a Bill. The House of Commons, which has spent twenty two or twenty-three nights in the discussion of the Bill, has bestowed on it an amount of care, attention, and time for which there are but few precedents."—Mr. Gladstone, Irish Land Bill, May 30th, 1870. "Hansard," cc., 1.611, 1,613—1,614.

"I believe the community of Ireland is well satisfied with the measure which has obtained the sanction of the Legislature; and that in Ireland there has been laid, for no very distant future, the foundations of solid political content . . . . In the face of the three countries, and in the case of civilised mankind, this Legislature has made a great effort to do justice, and all that has taken place leads me to the confident expectation *that that effort will be crowned with success.*"—Mr. Gladstone, at Greenwich. *Times*, Oct. 30th, 1871.

Mr. GLADSTONE'S HOPES FROM THE LAND BILL OF 1881.

"We have allowed ourselves to be torn from the purposes which we most cherished upon taking office. in order to apply what we thought needful remedies to the momentary and immediate wants of Ireland, and upon that work we have spent the first half of the session. We are now going to make an effort to deal with the sorest of the social wants and grievances of Ireland; and never in my knowledge, extending over my whole life, has a Government, at any rate. bestowed

greater care, labour, and anxiety in the consideration of the proposals which we shall have to submit to the House."—Mr. W. E. Gladstone, April 5th, 1881. "Hansard," cclx., 790-1.

"Well, sir, neither, I am bound to say, should we think it just to propose legislation on this great matter, on the ground, whether expressed or implied, of general misconduct on the part *of the landlords of Ireland; on the contrary, as a rule, they have stood their trial, and they have, as a rule, been acquitted* . . . . I have never, as a Minister, felt overwhelmed with as great a sense of the enormous importance of the topics and the propositions involved in it; and there is nothing that can legitimately be done by the Government which we shall hesitate to do for the purpose of promoting such legislation as shall deal effectively with the Land Question in Ireland. . . . *Justice, Sir, is to be our guide.* And, as it has been said that love is stronger than death, even so justice is stronger than popular excitement, stronger than the passions of the moment, stronger even than the grudges, the resentments, and the sad traditions of the past. Walking in that light we cannot err. *Guided by that light—that Divine light—we are safe.*"—Mr. W. E. Gladstone, when introducing the Land Law (Ireland) Bill, April 7th, 1881. "Hansard," cclx., 892. 898, and 926.

"I believe we have put into operation processes by which, not in a moment, but yet by a steady and sure advance, the Irishman will learn—to a great extent the Irishman has learnt—to cease to view in the law of the Government of his country his natural enemy. (Cheers.)"—Mr. W. E. Gladstone at Birmingham. June, 1877.

"I have heard the argument used many times in these discussions, that after this Bill passes there will be no purchasers of land in Ireland but the State. I do not believe that at all; but this I must say, that this proposition that the State is to buy nothing except within a limit of twenty years' purchase is, in my opinion, most unjust. The Government thought of introducing a limit of value; but I am bound to say that, adverting to the average sales that have taken place, we placed that limit at seven years higher than my hon. friend proposes; but, finally, we came to the conclusion that it was not desirable to have any limit at all, thinking it wiser neither to stimulate prices nor to artificially reduce them."—Mr. W. E. Gladstone, July 8th, 1881. "Hansard," cclxiii., 387.

"When the good results which the Government anticipated from this Bill are gradually realised, I shall be slow to believe that the Tory party will not acknowledge the benefits of the Act."—Mr. W. E. Gladstone, July 20th, 1881. "Hansard." cclxiii., 1422.

"*We have been endeavouring, by an almost supreme effort, to bring about a great and rapid change in the social condition of Ireland.* It is upon that ground alone this proposal can be justified; but resting upon that ground, we hope to receive the approval of the Committee."—Mr. W. E. Gladstone, July 21st, 1881. "Hansard," cclxiii., 1568.

. . . . . .

I would be bold enough now to repeat in effect what I said in 1870, which was that I then believed—the result having justified my expression of belief—that in a moderate but at the same time perfectly appreciably degree, the effect of the legislation then proposed has been to raise the capital value of estates in Ireland, as far as the landlords are concerned. I may repeat that Her Majesty's Government entertain the same hope, as far as this Bill is concerned. I do not now propose to enter into the question of whether the action of the Court in fixing a judicial rent may not, upon the whole, lower the rents rather than raise them, in its first operation. It is perfectly possible that this may be so, and I have no doubt that such a result is largely anticipated on the other side of the house; but if, in its first effects, the action of the Court has that tendency, then all I can say is, that it is perfectly within the probabilities of the case that its ulterior tendency in giving confidence, *in producing harmony between landlords and tenants*, and in bringing about a larger

development of the productive powers of the soil may be to repay the landlords for the incidental mischief of the Act, twofold or threefold.

. . . . . , . .

Without presuming to attempt to determine the future relations of the judicial rents to the present rents, I will only say that I, for one, shall be bitterly disappointed with the operation of the Act if the property of the landlords in Ireland does not come to be worth more than twenty years' purchase of the judicial rent. *We believe that the magic of security will scatter those evil influences, if Parliament adopts this legislation.* We believe that such a measure as this will obtain the moral support of all that is best throughout the country.

"I believe that the people of Ireland—and this is a matter which the next few weeks or months will have to determine—desire, in accordance with the advice of their old friends, their bishops and trusted friends, to make a full trial of the Land Act. (Hear, hear.) And, gentlemen, if they do, you may rely upon it, *that will give peace to the country—peace, which is not the object of these men;* and, therefore, in the prosecution of their policy the very thing which is most of all necessary for them to do is to intercept the progress of the Land Act. . . . . it the law, purged from defect and from any taint of injustice, is still to be refused, and the first condition of political society to remain unfulfilled, then I say, gentlemen, without hesitation, that the resources of civilisation are not yet exhausted. *We have, I repeat, no fear of the people of Ireland in the mass.* What we have a fear of is lest some should be corrupted by demoralising doctrines and lest—and it is the greatest fear of all—more, and many more, should, one by one, be terrified out of the exercise of their just constitutional rights, and unhappily induced, through intimidation and from no other motive, to make over their private liberty and the exercise of their civil rights into the hands of self-constituted dictators—(cheers)—and to place those rights under unknown provisions of an unwritten law, dictated by nothing but an arbitrary will."—Mr. W. E. Gladstone at the Guildhall. *Times*, October 14th, 1881.

"I am happy to say that the effect of this Act (Land Law Ireland Act) is that it is inducing the people, for the first time, to place confidence in the Courts of Justice. (Cheers.) *It is laying the foundation of that harmony between the people and the law, which, of all other objects, is familiar* to us on this side of the Channel, but unhappily is foreign and new in the history of Irish Associations. *It is a foundation of good*, on which I feel assured the people may build, and I feel convinced that the greater solidity of the social state which these changes are bringing about will well repay the landlords for everything they are called on to surrender."—Mr. W. E. Gladstone at Edinburgh. *Times*, September 2nd, 1884.

Is it possible for anyone to go through without anger and disgust, this long list of sentimental and fatuous predictions, originated without basis or justification, and only bolstered up by a lavish use of all the resources of rodomontade and exaggerated rhetoric? Anger, that the British people can ever tolerate a further and more disastrous experiment upon their credulity! Disgust, that there are men untaught by countless failures, still capable of pursuing the same course of needless disaster, and willing to sacrifice even the integrity of our Imperial Power on the altar of their blind incapacity of their selfish ambition.

Many other quotations might be made; but, if a crowning example of fatuity is wanted, it can best be supplied from a speech of Mr. Childers', made at Pontefract on December 5th, 1883. That eminent person then said:—

"About the Land Act and the Arrears Act, I may say on good authority that we are *now within measurable distance of the completion of what I may call the 'new settlement' of the country.* (Cheers.) This settlement, unless disturbed by wild schemes for the relief of the landlords by State purchase, will cement a new social order, brought about without revolution. (Cheers.)"

The "good authority" was naive. The "new settlement" and the "new social order" were admirable. But in view of Mr. Gladstone's subsequent Land Purchase Bill of 1886, "the wild schemes for the relief of landlords by State purchase," was truly superb and inimitable.

WHY A SPECIAL ALTERNATIVE SCHEME?

It is the fashion to assume that some special scheme must be substituted for that of Mr. Gladstone by those who oppose a policy of separation. But why? This is the age of fantastic nostrums and of political quackery. What real reason is there for treating Ireland differently from the rest of the United Kingdom? There are no rights or privileges granted to England and Scotland which are denied to Ireland. Rather is the opposite true. Full justice, pressed down, shaken together and running over, has been meted out to Irishmen during the past thirty years. If exceptional legislation to repress crime has been necessary, Ireland has also had exceptional legislation in her favour to benefit the agricultural classes. Four land bills of a very special kind have been since 1870 conceded to Ireland. If as England and Scotland have had their system of local government improved and extended, by all means let Ireland have the same now that the authority of the law is restored in Ireland, and the general social demoralisation of 1880 to 1883 has been remedied. Mr. Balfour's Local Government Bill of 1892 would have given to Ireland every fair privilege of local self-government, but the Irish and Radical parties obstructed its progress. This statement will be probably met with the cuckoo cry of coercion. But what is coercion? It is simply repression of crime. It means nothing more than the punishment of criminals, as they are punished in England and in every free and civilized country. The maintenance of the law is essential to the progress and prosperity of every community, just as needful for the poor as for the rich. There can be no popular progress and no national well-being where anarchical license prevails. The policy of the National League, unless speedily and effectually checked, would soon bring Ireland to the appalling condition of the South American Republics. The internal life of those wretched countries consists of internecine war; all freedom and prosperity have long since been withered up by the destroying

blight of lawlessness. All we ask is that the same supremacy of the law shall be asserted in Ireland as prevails in England and Scotland. We demand that men who commit foul murder shall meet the doom of murderers, that those who rob shall be punished as thieves, and those who maim and mutilate and terrorise shall be punished as the authors of cruel outrage are punished in England and Scotland. But so misguided and unwholesome has a large section of public opinion become upon this Irish question that men stigmatise as coercion in Ireland what in England they would call simple law and justice. By the pitiable weakness of Mr. Gladstone's Administrations during the twenty five years agitation has been turned into a fine art, and has been rendered the most profitable employment for clever Irishmen. In 1869 Mr. Gladstone confessed that the murder at Manchester and the explosion at Clerkenwell Gaol had extorted from him the destruction of the Irish Church. Mr. Parnell acknowledged the value of this fulcrum. Speaking at Brooklyn, January 15, 1880, he said:—

"Mr. Gladstone in one of his Midlothian addresses said that it was not until a policeman had been shot at Manchester by a Fenian, and Clerkenwell Prison had been blown up that the Irish Church question came within the domain of practical English politics. He admitted in that way that you have to act upon English public opinion in some extraordinary and unusual manner in order to obtain any attention for the Irish question We are, therefore, obliged to make the situation a very hot one indeed."

Darker spirits behind Mr. Parnell improved upon the earlier methods. Mr. Morley's scandalous speech in the House of Commons on the 12th of April, 1886 was a fresh incitement to the outragemongers. So long as agitation pays it will continue, and continue vigorously.

There are agrarian causes at work in Ireland which need careful attention, and Great Britain has grudged no practical remedy. The desire of the Irish peasant to own the soil he cultivates was gratified by Mr. Balfour's great Land Purchase Scheme of 1891, which benefits alike tenant and landowners; *but first and foremost the authority of the law must be asserted.* It is the primal condition of all national progress and social amelioration, and until the law prevails all else will fail.

MR. GLADSTONE'S NEW THEORY.

The English people have proved themselves to be a great Imperial race. They have colonised continents, civilised vast countries, given law and good administration to hundreds of millions of alien peoples. The two great characteristics of English ascendency have been individual liberty and the reign of equal law. English rule has conferred priceless blessings wherever it has been exercised with the old British qualities of courage,

resolution, and common sense, and, above all, with the unswerving assertion of the majesty of law.

Mr. Gladstone is of a different opinion. He thinks that the anarchical instincts of the Celts of Connemara are preferable to the reign of English order, law, and progress. Ireland and England have suffered bitterly enough in honour and tranquillity, and commercial prosperity from the license and anarchy which his misrule has fostered. Capital was for long paralysed, and terrified into foreign channels. The value of land was terribly depreciated. The resources which go to employ and to feed the wage-earning class were destroyed by his impolicy. The Nationalist ascendency over Ireland is based on directly opposite principles—upon the cruel suppression of all individual freedom, and upon the tyranny of a lawless terrorism.

MR. GLADSTONE'S HISTORY.

Mr. Gladstone's history is stranger and more perverted than the colouring he places upon modern opinion. He finds fault with the patriotism of that section of the Whig party, which, in the throes of the terrible and cruel French Revolution of 1793, supported Mr. Pitt in his far-sighted and courageous policy. He establishes a parallel between his own policy now and the un-English policy of Mr. Fox at the close of the last century. That great Liberal leader allied himself first with the anarchical Jacobins of the French Revolution, and then with the oppressive despotism of Napoleon I. Had Mr. Fox had his way, England would have looked on while that bloodthirsty tyrant subjugated Europe and oppressed the world. But for England—the glorious England of Pitt, of Nelson, and of Wellington—the military conqueror who overran all Europe, inflicting the most appalling miseries upon mankind, and causing the slaughter of two millions of men, would have been master of the world. Mr. Gladstone thinks that Mr. Fox's unpatriotic course was right, and that the true-hearted Whigs who then supported Mr. Pitt were wrong. As the Prime Minister has reviled Lord Palmerston who despised him, so he now tries to disparage Mr. Pitt, the greatest statesman that England has ever possessed.

The splendid display of British valour and statesmanship under Mr. Pitt's guidance rescued the liberties of Europe, saved England, established our naval supremacy, built up and secured the Empire we now possess, and gave the world fifty years of peace. Mr. Gladstone could not have chosen a worse comparison. Like Fox, in 1793, so now in 1886 Mr. Gladstone is acting as the foe of his own country, and as the supporter of anarchy and despotism. Like the patriot Whigs who refused to follow Fox in

his selfish and fatal policy, so Lord Hartington and his patriot friends, who have refused to follow Mr. Gladstone in his insane schemes of disunion, will save the Empire and earn the eternal gratitude of Englishmen present and to come.

UNIVERSAL FAILURE.

Mr. Gladstone has set up a novel and bogus set of principles. In these, cowardice disguised under the veil of false sentiment, supplants courage. Vacillation and Parliamentary vote-hunting supplant resolution. Every fantastic fad and harebrained crotchet supplant common sense. And, worst of all, a steady surrender to agitation, the payment of blackmail to lawbreakers, and the apotheosis of criminal agitation supplant the majesty of the law. Many are deluded by these wretched shams, dressed up in an elaborate clothing of ornate, equivocating, and, to the inexperienced, attractive rhetoric, and paraded before Parliament and the country with all the resources of an impressive manner, a singularly persuasive voice, and a great reputation. Mr. Matthew Arnold has touched the keystone of Mr. Gladstone's popularity, and of the fetish worship of which he is the object. His admirers have mistaken political victory for *success. There is nothing, no policy, no administrative function in which Mr. Gladstone has really succeeded.* His policy has been at all points a failure, complete, disastrous, and conspicuous. It has been for twenty-five years an abject failure in Ireland; it was a pitiable and sanguinary failure in Egypt; it was a costly and, for the future, a most woeful failure in Afghanistan and India; it was a dishonourable and humiliating failure in South Africa; it was a most stupid failure in the alienation of our European allies, and in the neglect of the interests of our colonies. His foreign policy has been one long series of disaster and disgrace, beginning with the betrayal of Denmark in 1864, and ending with the desertion of Gordon in 1885. Financially, his policy raised the Budget to portentous dimensions, greatly increased the burdens upon this country and upon India, and benefited nobody. Politically, it lowered our credit among the nations, and brought England into general feebleness and disrepute, if not contempt. Economically, it did nothing for British trade and for national prosperity, but rather *allowed* many avenues for our commerce to be cut off. Never was the outlook for British trade so dark and depressing as in 1885, after five years of Mr. Gladstone's ascendancy. Once again, in 1893, his fatal unrest and unsettlement is harassing and depressing trade in Ireland and throughout the Empire. At the polling booths alone has Mr. Gladstone ever triumphed, but his victory has already cost the electors very dear. If he wins in the great struggle now pending, the price

they will pay will be their national and Imperial greatness, Surrender to Russia, surrender to France, surrender to the United States, surrender to Germany, surrender to the Irish rebels, and lawbreakers, have reached the climax of evil and infamy in the proposed surrender of the Union of the three Kingdoms and of our loyal garrison in Ireland to the lawless conspiracy that is the bitter enemy both of English greatness and of Irish well-being.

CONSTITUTION OF THE 1886 PARLIAMENT.

The new legislature was to consist of two "orders," who were to sit and vote together in the same chamber, but who might on the demand of either order, sit and vote separately on any special occasion. Either "order" was to have a right of veto on the decisions of the other, and this veto was to be effective for a period of three years. The first order was to consist of the twenty-eight Irish peers, who were to be removed from the Imperial House of Lords, and relegated to the new Irish legislature, and of seventy-five elective members whose constituencies with voters possessing a holding worth at least £25 a year. These elective members of the first order, themselves required property qualification of at least £4,000, or an income of £200 a year. The second or lower order was to consist of the present representatives of Ireland, taken from the Imperial House of Commons, together with an additional 103 elected by the same constituencies, and in the same way. There were, therefore, to be 206 members of the second order. The new Irish legislature was to be quinquennial, and not as the Imperial House of Commons, a septennial body; that is, the Irish legislature was to be elected every five years. The solitary touch of humour in Mr. Gladstone's protracted oration was when he referred to the doubt whether the privilege of sitting in the new legislature would be largely taken avail of by the Irish peers.

THE LAND PURCHASE BILL OF 1886.

Mr. Gladstone stated in 1886 that land purchase and Home Rule are inseparably connected, and that the land purchase proposals of April 16th, 1886, were an essential part of the plan of an Irish separate Parliament laid before Parliament on the 8th. To quote his own words:—

"*The two questions of land and of Irish government are in our view*—whatever they may be in that of anyone else—*inseparable the one* from the other. They are the two channels through which we hope to find access . . to that question which is the most vital of all, namely, the question of social order in Ireland."

It is not, however, surprising to find that Mr. Gladstone, later on

discovered some grounds—to himself amply satisfactory—for the separation of these two "inseparable" measures, and for a complete alteration of his plan. The astonishing ease and the deplorable frivolity with which Mr. Gladstone changed his policy on this most important question are illustrated both in his proposals for Land Purchase and for a separate Irish Parliament. On April 8th, 1886, the Prime Minister emphatically stated that it was impossible to distinguish purely Irish from Imperial questions, and that, therefore, the exclusion of Irish representatives from the Imperial Parliament and the Imperial control of the Customs were vital parts of the Bill. His words were:—

"These two vital propositions are essential parts of the foundation of the Bill, viz., that the Irish representation in the Parliament at Westminster should cease, and next, that the fiscal unity of the Empire should be absolutely maintained."

But the opposition of Mr. Chamberlain and others extorted the confession that even these vital points were open to re-consideration and change. When Mr. Chamberlain left the Cabinet in April, 1886, the sum that the Prime Minister then deemed essential for his scheme of Land Purchase was £113,000,000. A few years before he had estimated the amount at £300,000,000. Mr. Gladstone afterwards reduced these sums to £50,000,000, and he thanked Mr. Chamberlain with mock humility for enabling him to see that his first proposal was too high. This reduction was a mere artifice to catch votes. Mr. Gladstone was particular to say that his scheme applied to all landholders and not merely to a part, and that he had no doubt that Parliament would in the future vote further sums if needful.

It was obviously monstrous and unjust that one-third of the landowners should receive compensation, and that the other two-thirds, equally deserving and equally imperilled, should be left out in the cold. Yet Mr. Gladstone's proposal must have come to this. He reduced the chances of the loyal landowners to a struggle for first place, and then it was "*occupet extremum scabies.*" It was, in fact, to be a scramble for the £50,000,000, in which those who were not first must lose all.

The outcome of Mr. Gladstone's Irish schemes would certainly have been separation and the repudiation by Ireland of the debt she would have owed to Great Britain, amounting to from £6,000,000 to £9,000,000 a year, according to the amount of injustice done to the landowners. That is, the taxpayers of England and Scotland would have been mulcted in a capital sum of £150,000,000 to £225,000,000, and would probably have to pay, in addition, the cost in blood and treasure.

Mr. Gladstone's speech, on the 16th April, 1886, was certainly one of the finest he has ever made. He showed, beyond the possibility of refutation, that if the loyal landowners in Ireland had been to blame in the past, the British Government and the English people shared to the full their responsibility. To quote his own words:—

"The deeds of the Irish landlords are our deeds. We are *participes criminis*; we, with power in our hands, looked on; we not only looked on, but we encouraged and sustained. The landowners were our garrison in Ireland. We planted them there and we replanted them in 1641, and in 1648, and again in 1798."

This is perfectly true, but it is not the whole truth. The Protestant population of British blood in Ireland has not only been the British garrison, but it has been the source of almost all the civilisation, commerce, and material prosperity which Ireland possesses. Loyal Ulster contains three-fourths of the manufactures and wealth of Ireland. Dublin and North-East Ulster—that is, the loyal landlords, merchants, manufacturers, professional men, and the flourishing Protestant working classes of these localities—pay nearly five-sixths of the revenue that the Imperial Exchequer now derives from Ireland.

Ireland would be hopelessly ruined, and the Imperial Exchequer would not have the smallest chance of receiving the contributions due from Ireland under any "Home Rule" Scheme Bill, if life in that country were rendered unendurable to the loyalists—as it assuredly would be—by a Nationalist Parliament.

MR. GLADSTONE'S COURSE IN 1886.

Mr. Gladstone introduced the first part of his scheme on April 8th. This was the first Separatist Bill, creating a separate Parliament for Ireland. Mr. Gladstone brought forward this measure in an elaborate speech of $3\frac{1}{2}$ hours' length. So great was the desire to be present that some members took up their places before 6 a.m. on that morning. Extra chairs had to be placed on the floor of the House. There were over 5,000 applications from strangers for admission into the galleries. The debate on the introduction or first reading was a very brilliant one, and lasted four nights.

On the 16th April, Mr. Gladstone introduced the second portion of his scheme, that is, the Land Purchase Bill, which he declared to be "inseparable from the other." The speech in which this was proposed by the Prime Minister was shorter but much more brilliant than that upon the "Government for Ireland Bill." The debate on the introduction of this second measure

only lasted a single night. Then there came a long period of delay. The reception of the scheme was extremely unfavourable. All independent opinion in and out of Parliament, and the Press, especially the great London newspapers, so strongly condemned the proposals that their author was much taken back.

CONCESSION AND SURRENDER.

Every effort was made in the two months that passed before the vote on the second reading, to satisfy the members of the Liberal party who had opposed the Bill. The exclusion of Irish members from the Imperial Parliament under the new arrangement was described by Mr. Gladstone, on April 8th, to be a "vital and essential" part of the scheme. He had also deliberately and forcibly stated that "the distinction between Irish and Imperial affairs *passed the wit of man*" to devise. To win over the dissentients this "vital and essential" principle was abandoned, and a plan was said to have been discovered. This plan, however, was never made public till February, 1893.

The effect of the Land Purchase Bill was minimised, and hints were freely dropped that it would never reach maturity. Finally, when the special offers made had failed to win over Mr. Chamberlain and his Radical followers, Mr. Gladstone made his last desperate offer to secure the passage of the second reading at the party meeting held on May 27th, 1886, at the Foreign Office. Here the Prime Minister proclamed that those who voted for the second reading would only vote for the bare "principle of a separate legislature for Ireland," and would not be committed to any details; that the Bills would be immediately withdrawn for the present session; and that before reintroducing them the Government would gladly welcome any amendments or any improved scheme.

For the moment it seemed as if this complete surrender would enable the second reading to be passed, and thus save the Government. With commendable promptitude, however, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach exposed the real meaning of this last manœuvre by moving the adjournment of the House the next night, Friday, May 28th, 1886.

Lord Hartington, in an admirable speech, strongly supported him from the Liberal benches. Mr. Chamberlain held firm, and the artifice failed. The main debate itself had been unreasonably delayed by the Government in order to give time for negotiations.

THE CRITICAL DIVISION.

The division took place on June 7th, at 1.30 a.m., and resulted in the defeat of Mr. Gladstone and his Separatist policy by the

unexpectedly large majority of 30 votes; the numbers being 341 against the Bill to 311 for. This minority of 311 included 86 Parnellites. There was, therefore, in *Great Britain a majority of 116 against the Government.* It is curious that in the House of Commons, elected a few weeks later in July, 1886, the majority, not for Great Britain only, but for the three kingdoms, was 116 against Separation. That is, the results of the elections were to exactly neutralise the Parnellite vote of 86 by a corresponding gain to the Unionist cause in England and Scotland. The most intense excitement prevailed when the numbers were declared. The Unionists cheered loud and long; the Parnellite members were in a condition of desperate frenzy, and their conduct in several instances greatly outraged Parliamentary decorum.

Mr. Gladstone immediately moved the adjournment of the House till the following Thursday, June 10th.

Supplies were voted up to the end of October, and on June 25th the Queen formally dissolved Parliament. The writs were issued on the 26th. The first elections took place on June 30th. The first poll was at Colchester, on July 1st, when a Conservative was returned by a majority of nearly 300. The last elections, excepting that for the Orkneys, were over by July 17th. The result was a striking and complete overthrow of Mr. Gladstone and his Separatist policy.

GREATNESS OF THE VICTORY.

The victory of the Union was a conspicuous one, and, in reality, was more complete than it appeared from the mere numbers. In England only 124 Gladstonian Separatists were returned out of 465 members, and in Scotland 43 out of 70 members. But of these 124 English Separatists, at least 50 were due to the miners' vote, which was notoriously given under the orders of the Miners' Trades Unions, and not at all upon political grounds. Then, again, in Wales there were 23 Gladstonian Separatists out of 30 members. But these were not elected upon Mr. Gladstone's Irish policy, or upon the issue of "Union or Separation." The Welsh would vote under the influence of their bitter Dissent and Radicalism against any question which was denounced as Conservative. Much the same happened in Scotland. There the influence of Mr. Gladstone's name was very great. It was also freely put about by the extreme sectaries of the "Free Kirk" that Mr. Gladstone would support disestablishment if only he were returned to power again. Yet with all this personal devotion and religious passion Mr. Gladstone's total vote only exceeded that of the Unionists by 28,000 out of 355,000, or less than 8 per cent. There were actually 90,000 fewer

Scotch electors who supported Mr. Gladstone's policy in 1886 than in 1885. Mr. John Bright's remark that, but for Mr. Gladstone's name, "not 20 members, outside the Parnellites, would have voted for the Bill" was perfectly true of the House of Commons.

CAUSES OF MR. GLADSTONE'S DEFEAT.

The main reasons for the public condemnations of the Bill were four:—First and foremost, a profound distrust and disapproval of Mr. Parnell and his followers, their conduct, policy, and professions. This permeated all classes and localities of the British electorate. It is well expressed in Mr. Bright's famous sentence:—"My six years' experience of them" (*i.e.* "the Irish Parliamentary party," "of their language in the "House of Commons, and of their deeds in Ireland, *makes it "impossible for me to consent to hand over to them the property and the "rights of five millions of the Queen's subjects*, our countrymen in "Ireland."

This feeling was a Nemesis and a just one upon the Irish Parnellite party, who fattened on the outrages, terrorism, and extortion of the Land and National Leagues. If not themselves directly responsible for murders and criminal violence upon man and beast, they were the confederates and friends of the outragemongers, and benefited by their lawlessness.

The second cause was the strong sense of sympathy with and duty towards the Irish loyalists, and an intense aversion to placing the loyal Irish of the Protestant faith and of British blood under the tyranny of a Parnellite Parliament and of the Roman Catholic Hierarchy in Ireland.

The third cause was the conviction that this policy of Mr. Gladstone's meant separation; that is, the breaking up of the United Kingdom and the dismemberment of the Empire. This feeling was very strong among the more intelligent electors.

There was, lastly, a widespread feeling against the cost of Mr. Gladstone's policy. It was not only the Land Purchase Bill and the £150,000,000 that were unpopular. All the financial arrangements of the scheme were looked upon with grave suspicion. The present of £1,400,000 of British money every year to Mr. Parnell's Parliament; the imposition of £52,000,000 of the Irish share of the National Debt upon the British taxpayers; the freeing of Ireland for the future from all extra contribution towards the cost of imperial wars; the heavy expense which Great Britain would

have to incur for naval and military defence against an armed and organised Ireland; the probability of a large influx of Irish labourers into this country if capital and manufactures were driven out of Ireland by a Parnellite Parliament—all weighed against the Bills.

HONOUR TO WHOM HONOUR IS DUE.

Among the men to whom the country owes a deep debt of gratitude for the result of these elections, and to whom the salvation of the Union is mainly to be attributed, the name of Edward Saunderson, the member for North Armagh, stands foremost, if not first. With the appearance of Colonel Saunderson in the House of Commons there opened a new era in the relations between Ireland and England. Colonel Saunderson faced Mr. Parnell and his formidable phalanx, told the truth about them, turned them into ridicule, and beat them most completely on their own ground. Moreover, he demonstrated to the country that the Loyalists of Ireland were a force that must be reckoned with, and that in them this country possessed not only some of the staunchest and most splendid of her children, but a body of resolute men who would defend their liberties and their rights to the last drop of their blood.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS.

The Unionist and Conservative triumph was most remarkable in England itself; that is, in the heart and centre of these realms, and of the British Empire. *England* pronounced irresistibly for the Union. There were 340 English members opposed to Separation, of whom 284 were Conservatives and 56 Liberal Unionists. That is to say, England returned a verdict of 340 members for the Union, as against only 124 Gladstonian Separatists; or a Unionist majority of over two and a half to one. Of these the English boroughs sent 166 Unionists, as against 60 Separatists; and the English counties 169 Unionists, as against 65 Separatists. Scotland was not so good; the proportion being 29 Unionists to 43 Separatists; but the voting power was very close throughout. There were 163,000 Scotch Unionist electors, as against 190,000 Separatists. The Unionist vote was strongest in the best and most prosperous portions of the Lowlands of Scotland, that is, in the most Saxon or English part of the country.

It was in 1886, as also in 1893, the Celtic fringe around England, always Separatist and crotchety and turbulent, from which

Mr. Gladstone got his main support. The Roman Catholic Celts of the south and west of Ireland returned 85 Nationalist Separatists in 1886 and 1893, 80. The bitter Dissenting Celts of Wales returned 23 Separatists in 1886, and in 1893, 28. The Crofter Celts of the extreme north of Scotland also returned a solid Separatist vote. Deduct these, about 150 Celtic Separatists, and Mr. Gladstone only had in 1886 a wretched following of 124. However, the English race never has, and never will be, dictated to, or ruled by, the less-civilised Celt.

The voting returns were even more significant. In the elections of November, 1885, 2,156,952 electors voted for Gladstonian candidates, and 1,943,316 for Conservative candidates, thus giving a majority of 213,636 votes for Mr. Gladstone. In the elections of July, 1886, the total Conservative vote was 1,106,651, the Liberal Unionist vote 417,456, and the Gladstonian vote 1,347,983. This gave a nominal majority for the combined Unionists of 176,124 votes. These figures showed a decrease of votes forMr. Gladstone of 808,969, or 37 per cent.

But this by no means does justice to the Unionist victory, nor to the strength of the Conservative reaction. There was an unusually large proportion of Tory seats uncontested in the elections of 1886—91 seats. The Conservative total vote, therefore, lost in the comparison the benefit of its great preponderance in these, the safest Tory seats. Allowing roughly a majority of 1,000 in each of these seats—which, in view of what happened in other constituencies, and of the results in November, 1885, is a low estimate, and deducting the same number for the 34 Gladstonian seats that were not contested—some 57,000 votes would have to be added to the Unionist majority, giving the Union a total majority of 233,000 votes in 1886.

And this was in the face of the personal devotion of a large portion of the electors of Mr. Gladstone; of the considerable Irish vote in many of our large towns and in Western Scotland; of the immense power of Radical Dissent in Wales and other districts; of the strong Gladstonian bias, of the Scotch Free Kirk and of the solid pro-Gladstonian mining vote, which gave him fifty seats on grounds wholly distinct from the main issue. The triumph of the Union among the electors was, therefore, as remarkable as the number of seats gained in Parliament.

THE AMERICAN VIEW OF THE IRISH QUESTION.

No Englishman will need to be assured that Americans look at the treatment of the Irish question by the English Government

with a very vivid interest, and one in which an intelligent study of the Irishman and experience of his qualities enter to add a personal colour. So far as I can see, there is, outside of the Irish part of our community, *no sympathy whatever with Irish agitation for separation.* We have, too, lately been brought face to face with the question of separation of the State and the consequences of unsound decentralisation to have any admiration for measures so utterly retrograde in State organisation as the division and weakening of the organ of paramount authority which must be the end of the Nationalist movement in Ireland. We know the advantages as well as the disadvantages of a federal system, and I am of the opinion that most *thoughtful Americans favour rather the strengthening of the centralising tendency* than the contrary, and recognize that the general prosperity of the country and efficiency of our Government would be promoted by the Federal authorities taking over to their control some prerogatives still retained by the States. Brought face to face with all the consequences of a great scission, we were obliged to study its probable effects with all the concentration a nation is capable of, and the result was as you all know, that we decided at any cost of blood and money to prevent it; and time has shown, I believe, that we were right.

And the Irish we have ever with us, and we are not, as some of you seem to be, blinded by apprehension, interest, or any party animosities to the fact that *Nationalist movement means a total and definite separation from England and the formation of an Independent State, necessarily a hostile State,* and, being weak, necessarily always on the look out for some Foreign Government with an interest to sustain Ireland as against England. This we conclude, knowing the Irishman familiarly and to the core. *We know him to be unstable, inconstant, and inconsequent; quarrelsome, given to demagogy and faction; an excellent servant or soldier, but a detestable politician, whether as boss or rank and file partisan. He is constitutionally disloyal,* and even under a Government which has, like ours, given him the fullest rights and all the privileges which any American has, except that of becoming President, *he has no conception of loyalty* towards the country which has adopted him, and which he has professed to adopt, but individually and collectively, *habitually regards it as only a machine for his private emolument and advancement,* and an outside base of operations against England—operations in which he ardently hopes, at whatever loss to America, to compromise the Republic to which he has sworn allegiance. *Cœlum non animum mutat—he hates England and does not love America,* and he considers his substantial treason to the latter quite justified by his animosity to the former.

This is a curious position and well worth the reflection which,

probably, no Irishman has ever given it. *The German Republican refugee comes to America and becomes an American*; even the Pole, when he settles, ceases to wage war in his heart on Russia, and considers his new home as the object of his labours, if not at once of his affections. The Irishman comes from a land which, perhaps, whisky and ignorance oppress as much as the landlords, and where the Government has certainly made concessions which no other would have made, and which, as we fully understand, have not been accorded to the English population; and, coming from that land to one which instals him in all the dignity of a citizen, invested with plenary political powers from the day in which he becomes a voter, he is no more concerned with the political issues vital to the United States than with those at stake in Turkestan, but beats his brains to find some way in which he can lend his new allegiance to some intrigue against England, or help some party which will, as he hopes, adopt a policy offensive to the mother country of most Americans, at no matter what sacrifice or danger to the United States. *He is always an Irishman—always an enemy of England*, and coolly calculates the adoption of any measure, however ruinous to America, provided it will pay a part of the debt of revenge he fancies he owes to England. *Venal in the last degree on all ordinary questions*, and holding his vote at the command of the highest bidder, he will forego his five dollars for it if his head centre says that Brown must be defeated because he voted in the House of Representatives for a resolution which expresses sympathy with the Queen; or that O'Reilly must be elected because he is ready to vote for a resolution to withdraw the American Minister from London because the English Government have imprisoned an Irish-American agitator, a fellow who emigrated for his safety, and having made his preliminary declaration of his intention to become a citizen, runs back to continue his plottings under cover of the new Nationality. In these cases the Irish vote goes solid where it is told to go. *In short, Paddy is never an American—he is but one of a band of political freebooters encamped on American soil preparing for a raid on England* which they will never have the courage to execute, and using the rights they have acquired as Americans to help their countrymen in Ireland to carry on the war on landlords and the English system

Our politicians, cowardly and corrupt, stand always ready to purchase the Irish support at the polls by voting for any buncombe resolution about the oppression of Ireland, or against any measure which is supposed to be for the good of England, and bury out of sight the moral obligation of the country and international good faith by an alliance with what they know to be practically political brigandage, and, party against party, outbid each other in wordy promises which they know the law will not permit them to

fulfil, or in sympathy, expressed or implied, with acts which they know to be of the grossest political immorality.

If this is a fair picture of the Irishman in American politics (and I challenge the expression of honest American opinion to the contrary), it is easy to conjecture what will be the result of his introduction into English politics as a Home Ruler. *The first consequence would be the restoration to Irish politics of all the heroes who now send dynamite and dollars*, extorted from Irish servant girls and labourers, for the war against English civilisation. Nobody here is ignorant of the intention of these veiled patriots to use every appliance and facility granted them for the establishment of the Irish Republic, and that every concession granted by the English Government is so much more vantage towards their supreme purpose. If anybody in England doubts it, it must be through wilful blindness or incapacity.

Give Irishmen the liberties you give Englishmen, Scotchmen, and Welshmen—so much and no more—and there is no race in existence competent, as sinning less, to throw stones at you.—*An American Correspondent of the Times.*

THE IRISH HORRORS OF 1641 AND 1798.

WHAT THE LOYALISTS HAVE TO DREAD.

The unshakable resolve of the Irish loyalists never to submit to a Nationalist and Priest-ridden Parliament in Dublin, is well-founded in past experience. The men of Ulster know what their ancestors and kinsmen suffered when the Celtic and Roman Catholic elements were in the ascendant. It is especially noteworthy that the rebellion of 1798 and its horrors took place after the Irish had possessed a separate parliament for 16 years, and that the Union was established in 1800 because of the absolute and ruinous failure of that separate parliament. The following quotations give authentic narratives of what has taken place in Ireland:—

1641.

[From Froude's "English in Ireland."]

IT was determined by the Irish Roman Catholic rebels that, on October 23rd, 1641, Sir Phelim O'Neill should surprise Londonderry; Sir Henry O'Neill, Carrickfergus, Sir Con Magennis, Newry, Lord Maguyre, and Hugh MacMahon undertook the more difficult enterprise at Dublin, while on the whole North on the same day the Irish people were to rise and dispose of the English settlers and their families. The order was to drive them from their houses, strip them, man, woman, and child, of their property, strip them even of their clothes upon their backs, to take such chances of life as the elements would allow, in the late autumn, to human

existence turned adrift amidst steel and rain, without food or covering. Through the timely information of Owen O'Conolly, Dublin was saved. MacMahon and Lord Maguyre were taken; Roger Moore and the rest finding that their stroke had missed, escaped out of the town.

Unhappily, there had been no Owen O'Conolly to sound the alarm in the Ulster farmhouses. The Ulster farmers, dispersed, surprised, and isolated, became the helpless victims of Irish ferocity on a scale on which it has rarely had an opportunity of displaying itself.

On the morning of that fatal Saturday there appeared before the houses of the settlers and their tenants in the six escheated counties gangs of armed Irish, who demanded instant possession, and, on being admitted, ejected the entire families, and stripped most of them to the skin.

Many resisted and were killed; many, the young, vigorous men especially, who could save their own lives by flight, sought shelter for their women and their little ones in the homes of their Irish neighbours, with whom they had lived in intimacy. The doors of their neighbours were opened in seeming hospitality; but within there were not human beings—not even human savages—but ferocious beasts. The priests had so charmed the Irish, and laid such bloody impressions on them, as it was held a mortal sin to give relief or protection to the English. Fugitives admitted to shelter are sacred in the Arab tent or the Indian wigwam.

The ill-success at Dublin was not the only disappointment. Sir William Cole saved Enniskillen. Naked men, flying for their lives, carried the alarm to Derry, Coleraine, and Carrickfergus, and the inhabitants had time to close their gates.

In a fortnight, with the exception of the few places mentioned as having escaped, every town, village, fort, or private house belonging to a Protestant in the six counties, and in Down and Monaghan, was in the hands of the insurgents, while the roads were covered with bands of miserable fugitives dragging themselves either towards Dublin, or Derry, or Carrickfergus, pursued and harassed as they went by bands of wretches, who were hunting them like starved jackals. Murder, when the spirit of it has gone abroad, becomes a passion, and man grows more ferocious than a beast of prey. Savage creatures of both sexes, yelping in chorus, and brandishing their skenes; boys practising their young hands in stabbing and torturing the English children—these were the scenes which were witnessed daily through all parts of Ulster. The fury extended even to the farm stock, and sheep and oxen were slaughtered, not for food, but in the blindness of rage. The distinction between Scots and English soon vanished. Religion was made the new dividing line, and the one crime was to be a Protestant. The escorts proved in most cases but gangs of assassins. In the wildest of remembered winters the shivering fugitives were goaded along the highways stark naked and foodless. If some, happier than the rest, found a few rags to throw about them, they were torn instantly away. If others, in natural modesty, twisted straw ropes round their waists, the straw was set on fire. When the tired little ones dropped behind, the escort lashed the parents forward, and the children were left to die. One witness, Adam Clover, of Slonory, in Caxill, swore that he saw a woman who had been thus deserted set upon by three Irish women, who stripped her naked in frost and snow. She fell in labour under their hands, and she and her child died. Many were buried alive. Those who died first were never buried, but were left to be devoured by dogs and rats and swine. Some were driven into rivers and drowned, some hanged, some mutilated, some ripped with knives. The priests told the people, "*That the Protestants were worse than dogs; they were devils, and served the devil, and the killing of them was a meritorious act.*" One wretch stabbed a woman with a baby in her arms, and left the infant in mockery on its dead mother's breast. The insurgents swore in their madness they would not leave English man, woman, or child alive in Ireland. They flung babies into boiling pots, or tossed

them into the ditches to the pigs. They put out grown men's eyes, turned them adrift to wander, and starved them to death. Two cowboys boasted of having murdered thirty women and children, and a lad was heard swearing that his arm was so tired with killing, that he could scarce lift his hand above his head.

The towns could not hold the numbers which flocked into them, and the plague came to add to the general horrors. In Coleraine, in four months, six thousand were said to have died of the pestilence alone. The scenes in Dublin were still more frightful. Sir John Temple was so affected by the terrible spectacle passing under his own eyes, that his language in describing it rises into a tone of profound and tragic solemnity :—

"Multitudes of English daily came up in troops, stripped and miserably despoiled; persons of good rank and quality, covered over with old rags, and even without any covering but a little twisted straw to hide their nakedness. Wives came lamenting the murder of their husbands, mothers of their children—barbarously destroyed before their faces. Some, over-wearied with long travel, and so surbated, came creeping on their knees ; others, frozen with cold, ready to die in the streets. The city was thus filled with most lamentable spectacles of sorrow, which, in great numbers, wandered up and down in all parts, desolate, forsaken, having no place to lay their heads on, no clothing to cover them, no food to fill their hungry bellies. The Popish inhabitants refused to minister the least comfort to them, so as those sad creatures appeared like ghosts in every street. Barns, stables, and outhouses were filled with them, yet many lay in the open street, and these miserably perished. The churches were the common receptacles of the meanest sort of them, who stood there in most doleful posture as objects of charity, in so great multitude as there was scarce passage for them. Those of better quality, who could not pass themselves to be common beggars, crept into private places, and some that had not private friends wasted silently away, and died without noise. So bitter was the remembrance of their former condition, and so insupportable the burden of their present calamity to many of them, as they refused to be comforted. I have known some that lay almost naked, and, having clothes sent, laid them by, refusing to put them on : others that would not stir to fetch themselves food, though they knew where it stood ready for them, but they continued to lie in their own rags, and so worn out with the misery of the journey and cruel usage, having their spirits bent, their bodies wasted, and their senses failing, lay here pitifully languishing ; and soon after they had recovered this town very many of them died, leaving their bodies as monuments of the most inhuman cruelties used towards them."

The circumstantial minuteness of the picture is itself a guarantee of its fidelity. For the larger portion of these miserable people died. The Dublin churchyards could not hold the multitudes that were crowding into them, and two large fields were enclosed as cemeteries before the forlorn wretches could find rest even for their bones.

Of the numbers that perished it is rash to offer so much as a conjecture. In the midst of excitement so terrible, extreme exaggeration was inevitable, and the accounts were more than usually hard to check, because the Catholics, in their first triumph, were as eager to make the most of their success as the Protestants to magnify their calamity. In the first horror it was said that 200,000 persons had perished in six months. For these enormous figures the Catholic priests were responsible. They returned the numbers of the killed in their several parishes up to March, 1642, as 154,000. To these may have been conjecturally added the crowds who died of exposure, want, or the plague in Dublin and the other towns. Sir John Temple considered that 150,000 perished in two months, or 300,000 in two years. At the trial of Lord Maguyre the figures were sworn at 152,000.

THE IRISH REBELLION OF 1798.

THE RISING AT PROSPEROUS AND KILDARE.

[From Froude's "English in Ireland."]

It was arranged that on the preconcerted signal, the non-arrival of the mail from Dublin on the night of the 23rd May, Naas, Clane, and Prosperous were to be attacked at the same moment; Esmonde and the disaffected yeomen were to assist, and the officers and the loyal part of the soldiers were to be destroyed. Surprise was an essential part of the scheme. At the two latter places many of the soldiers were billeted in private houses. If off their guard, they might be found divided, and could then be dealt with easily. Swayne had been directed to collect the arms of the people at Prosperous. On Sunday, the 20th of May, he took his North Cork men to the Catholic Chapel. Father Higgins, the priest, like his brother at Rathcool, addressed his congregation on the duty of submission to the authorities, and Dr. Esmonde, who had ridden over from Clane in the morning to support his brother officer, spoke to them as a Catholic in the same tone. A number of peasants, in apparent obedience, surrendered their pikes. In the priest's presence they expressed regret for having been betrayed into the conspiracy, and promised to have no more to do with it.

To avoid recognition by his comrades, Esmonde undertook the attack at Prosperous, leaving his own captain, half deserted, to be destroyed by others. On the afternoon of the 22nd, when the hour was drawing near, he paid Swayne another visit, and dined with him at the hotel in the town. Father Higgins was again present, and he and Esmonde told Swayne that the people were really penitent. Very many of them wished to give up their arms, but they dared not bring them in the day, for fear of being recognised by their confederates They would have brought them at night and have laid them down in the streets, but they were afraid of the sentinels. Swayne, credulous and good-natured, suspected nothing. He ordered the sentinels, if they saw men moving in the street after dark, to take no notice of them.

The mails left Dublin that night as usual. They were all stopped on the roads by the country people, according to the general instructions, and the call to arms went out. At two in the morning, when sleep was deepest, before the first streaks of dawn had begun to show, Esmonde, with his Clane yeomen and an unknown multitude of ruffians, chiefly armed with pikes, came into Prosperous. The sentinels gave no alarm, and were killed; and then at once, before a note of warning had been raised, the rebel band flung themselves with a wild yell upon the barracks. The door went down. Swayne's room was on the ground floor. They plunged in and stabbed him as he was springing from his bed. The soldiers, startled from their sleep, snatched their muskets and rushed out. The mob swung back into the street, barricaded the doors to keep them secure, and flung fire into the cellars, which were filled with straw and faggots. Beset before and behind, the miserable men were driven from the lower rooms up the stairs. As the flames pursued them they sprung out of the windows, the mob below catching them as they fell on their pikes, and as each victim writhed upon the point, receiving him with a fierce "Hurrah!" The North Corks were Irishmen and Catholics, and were treated as traitors to both creed and country, deserving no mercy and finding none. All who were in the barracks were killed or desperately wounded.

The Ancient Britons were quarted in a private house. They, too, were hated almost equally, for they had made themselves notorious in the disarming of Ulster. Eight of the twenty-three leapt out of a back window, and escaped across the country in the darkness. The rest were killed. Their horses, arms, and uniforms were taken by the rebels.

As the roof of the barracks fell in, men and women flung themselves weeping in each others arms. Tears only could express their joy. "Ireland is ours again," they cried. "Dublin is taken—Naas is taken—Ireland is ours! Where are the heretics?" shrieked savage voices. "Down with the heretics!" The depression of Irish manufactures had been the first article of Ireland's complaints. Manufactures had come back, finding work for the starving and food for the hungry, but the benefactor of Prosperous was an Englishman and a Protestant. The day was breaking. A shout arose, "To Brewer's house!" A few moments later Mr. Brewer was lying in his shirt on the pavement with his skull cloven by an axe the mob yelling over the body of "the heretic tyrant." The landlord's turn followed. Mr. Staines, the owner of most of the town, was staying, unluckily for himself, with a lady at a house in the neighbourhood. The alarm had been given. The lady concealed her guest, and when the insurgents came to the door and demanded him she said that he was gone. The watch had been too good. They knew that he was in the house. They could not find him, and they cried for fire to fetch him out. To save needless destruction Mr. Staines, like a brave man, came out of his hiding place, and was instantly shot.

The same scenes had been going on throughout the country wherever there was a town or village held in the name of the Government, and outside the towns wherever Protestants were to be found. All day long terrified families were streaming into Naas. All day long the smoke of burning homesteads was seen rising from every point of the horizon. Kildare town had been considered secure, so many arms had been surrendered there without any resistance. General Walford, who was in charge, had withdrawn on the 23rd to join General Dundas at Kilcullen. He was no sooner gone than Kildare was occupied by 2,000 rebels with crosses painted on their pikes. General Dundas, irresolute and unequal to the sudden call upon him, was confounded by the sudden outpouring of so many nests of hornets. They were here, they were there, they were on all sides. A few hundreds of them showed themselves near Kilcullen. He sent a party of Yeomanry cavalry to ride them down. They threw themselves into line; the Yeoman rode upon the pikes only for their horses to fall, and for themselves to be pierced as they rolled on the ground. Dundas fell back on Naas, taking the judges with him, who were on their way to Clonmel assizes. Kilcullen was left to its fate. The gentry and clergymen were deserted to shift for themselves. Their houses were burnt. Those who failed to escape were piked. The entire country was a scene of ruin, terror, and confusion. The news of Dundas' retreat spread south. The same night several thousand insurgents gathered in Sir Edward Crosbie's park, outside Carlow, led by a farmer named Roach. The town was held like Naas, by a company or two of militia. At half-past two, on the morning of the 25th, the rebel force went in upon them in the darkness, with the wild Irish howl. After the defeat of the yeomanry at Kilcullen, they expected to carry all before them, and came on with the utmost audacity. They were expected. Part of the garrison were drawn up in the market place, and received them with a volley, which turned the heads of their column. They swerved and flung themselves on the gaol. Another volley from the gaol windows was delivered into the middle of them with deadly effect. They reeled, staggered, and then, struck with panic, flung down their pikes and tried to fly or hide themselves in houses. The troops had heard on the previous evening of the treachery and cruelty at Prosperous. Savage in turn, they chased the miserable wretches into the bye lanes and passages, shooting and bayoneting every man that they found. Four hundred bodies were taken up and buried at daybreak. Many others were carried off wounded, and died afterwards. It was supposed that the number of those who lost their lives was at least six hundred.

The intention had been to encompass Dublin with insurrection, to force the Government to relax its grasp upon the city. On the same 25th the Meath insurgents rose and assembled on Tara Hill, the scene of the mythic glories of the ancient Irish Kingdom, four thousand strong. On the 26th they were attacked by

Captain Preston and Lord Fingal, with 200 Fencibles and as many mounted yeoman. Their commander, distinguished by his green uniform, was killed. Three hundred and fifty rebels fell with him. The rest were scattered over the country, to venture no more battles, but to confine themselves to private murders, for which they were better fitted by experience and temper.

Finding that Dublin remained quiet; that the camp at Tara had been broken up, and that the attack on Carlow had failed, the Kildare men who were in force at Kilcullen, thought it prudent to temporise. If the general insurrection had missed fire, they held it better to save and reserve themselves for another opportunity.

THE INSURRECTION IN WEXFORD.

On the 23rd of May, after Lord Edward's arrest, when it was known that a rising was intended, the magistrates issued a notice that unless the pikes were given up, companies of soldiers would be sent among the villages on free quarter; and three gentlemen of family and fortune, who had made themselves notorious for the violence of their political opinions—Mr. Bagenal Harvey, Mr. John Colclough, of Ballyteigne, and Mr. Edward Fitzgerald, of New Park—were arrested and confined in Wexford Gaol. On the 25th came the news that Kildare and Carlow were in arms, and it fell like sparks on tinder ready to kindle. On the 26th began the month of horrors, which has left one more indelible stain on the history of the Catholics of Ireland.

On that Saturday evening, the long May day fa'ling to twilight, a beacon was seen to blaze into flame on Carrigrua Hill, ten miles west of Ferns. A fire answering to it was seen immediately after on Boulabogue, between Carrigrua and the sea; and by an instinct easily explicable the inhabitants of Wexford felt that the hour was come, and prepared to meet it. If there had been doubt before of the character and aims of the rebellion, that doubt was no longer to exist. Conceived originally by Jacobins, it had become by this time a struggle of the Irish Catholics to get possession of the county. Father John Murphy, of Boolavogue, was the son of a peasant of Ferns, and had been educated for the priesthood at Seville. He had been settled in his own country a few miles from his birthplace, and there he had remained waiting for the salvation of Israel, and had grown into a big, course, powerful man of forty, when his country called upon him for his services. It is to be hoped that his action was unpremeditated, for he had recently taken an oath of allegiance, and made solemn protests of loyalty. The arrest of Lord Edward had, perhaps, absolved him.

This man it was that lighted the signal fire on Carrigrua Hill. The next day was Whit-Sunday, and Father John was about his work betimes. His first move was against his Protestant rival pastor, Mr. Burrows. The Protestant families in the neighbourhood, seeing the fire, had crowded for shelter into the parsonage of the adjoining parish of Kilmuckridge.

Father John, with an army of pikemen, appeared soon after daybreak on the lawn before the door. He demanded arms, and when the arms were refused, set fire to the outhouses. From the outhouses the flames spread to the parsonage itself. Mr. Burrows, a harmless gentlemen, appeared at a window and begged for mercy for his family and flock. He was told that if they would come out their lives should be spared. He obeyed, and was instantly piked, with his son, a lad of sixteen, and seven of his male parishioners. The women were spared. Father John was swift, for he had a long day's work before him. Gathering up the muskets and fouling-pieces which had belonged to the house, he was soon in motion again, leaving Mrs. Burrows, with her niece and four children, sitting among the bleeding bodies, beside her dead husband and her dying boy in front of her blazing home.

Having destroyed the heretic clergyman, the next object was the heretic bishop. The palace was at Ferns, and Ferns being Father John's native place, the purgation of it was of special consequence to him. While the day was still early, he marched across country, pausing only to fire such Protestants' dwelling-houses as lay in his way Perhaps, too, having begun the Holy War, he was anxious for a blessing on it, and halted to say mass. Arrived at Ferns, he applied the torch in like manner to heretic residences, but his special object was the palace. Dr. and Mrs. Cleaves and their children had happily escaped. Their servants and their labourers, many of whom the bishop supported out of charity, gave Father John a hearty welcome. An orphan lad, whom the bishop had found starving, and had fed and brought up and educated, displayed his gratitude by singular eagerness to assist in the injury of his benefactor. The palace was plundered. The valuable library was torn to pieces. The vellum bindings of the books of divinity were stripped off and used for saddle covers. When the spoils were all secured, the shell of the house was set on fire, and all that would burn was consumed.

THE CAMP AT VINEGAR HILL.

The insurgents were increasing with marvellous rapidity, and their numbers soon amounted to many thousands. Men in good position came—John Hay, of Newcastle, a so-called gentleman ; Edward Roche, a wealthy yeoman ; Father Roche, his kinsman, and twenty other priests. With men came women, some vagrants, some whisky selling, some to dress their husband's or brother's food, some for the wild enjoyment of the strife. With such organisation as he could extemporise, Father John made his preparations for their entertainment. The weather was warm and dry, and well-suited for an out-door encampment. The Protestant houses in Enniscorthy, and for many miles round, were searched and relieved of their contents. Before the evening of Whit-Tuesday the slopes and brow of Vinegar Hill were dotted over with hundreds of booths, of motley colours, shape and material. Carpets, window curtains, sheets, blankets, whatever came first to hand, were stretched on poles, and made into rude tents. The women appropriated the ladies' wardrobes, and fluttered in silks and feathers. Barrels of wine and ale were rolled up out of the cellars of squire and parson, and mounted on tressels, for all who pleased to help themselves. Pianos were brought for such as had skill in music. Blind minstrels were gathered from far and near, and sounded out the old airs of Ireland on harps, which but a few days before were touched by delicate fingers. In curious contrast, the manners and habits were revived spontaneously of the great days of Erin's ancient chiefs. Cattle were driven in from neighbouring farms and parks. At feeding times cows and oxen were knocked down, and slices were cut from the unflayed and fresh bleeding carcases, and toasted on the points of pikes.

All sorts were gathered together—men of good condition, traders, farmers, shopkeepers, interspersed with plundering ruffians. All ranks blended harmoniously together in the upspring of the true Irish nature, such as were left to itself it tended to become. So little trust had they in each others' honesty that they slept on their faces, with their hats and shoes under them, lest they should wake and find them gone. Two exercises only were discharged with regularity and punctuality on Vinegar Hill. Law might be forgotten, but religion was remembered. Twenty priests said mass each day at different points of the camp. Each day a holocaust of Protestants was offered to the national divinities. The windmill on the brow of the hill and a barn at the bottom were appropriated as prisons, and gangs of ruffians were sent out to scour the country and bring in every Protestant that could be found. Ringwood, where the feeblest of the Enniscorthy fugitives had taken refuge for the night, was drawn in the morning, as hounds draw a fox cover. Many poor creatures—and those perhaps the happiest—were piked upon the spot. Others were carried captive to the hill,

where a council of leaders was held to determine on the treatment of them. Some were for an instant and undiscriminating massacre; others — Father Roche especially—were against murder in cold blood altogether. It was decided finally that those only should be put to death who could be proved to have been actively traitors to the Irish cause. A court martial was established in permanent session outside the windmill. The prisoners were brought before it in batches, like the aristocrats before Fouquier Tinville, and, on receiving sentence, were passed out to instant execution on the pikes of the rebel guard in waiting. On the first day, as an inauguration ceremonial for the camp, twenty-four victims were condemned, and were stabbed or shot. As the Windmill prison was emptied it was re-filled from the barn. The barn was kept supplied from the country. Every day, so long as the camp continued, the bloody work went forward – the crimson blossoming of the tree of liberty which had been planted by Grattan in '82. A large tub of water was daily blessed to sprinkle the miserable assassins, and persuade them that they were Christ's soldiers.

On the morning of the 31st the rebels from Three Rocks moved on to Wexford. They halted outside the barriers for the whole line to kneel and pray, and they then rushed in upon the spoils. For three days there was a saturnalia of madness, the houses of the Protestants were sacked, the gaol was thrown open, the prisoners, Bagenal Harvey among them, were released in triumph, and loyal Protestants were thrust in to take their places. Wild Amazons rode about the streets with plumed hats and pikes in hand. A man, named Keogh, once a captain in the army and a magistrate, was appointed governor, and the green flag of Ireland floated over the barracks. The ships which had been hired to carry the fugitives to England were still in the harbour. Among the largest shipowners at Wexford was a man named Dixon, a tavern and billiard-room keeper on the quay. This person, having extorted enormous sums for the use of his vessels, had contrived under various pretexts to delay their sailing. When the English flag was hauled down, and the Irish harp was blowing out in its place, the Protestants on board prayed the captains to cut their cables and depart. The same sacred emblem of liberty was run up for answer to the mastheads. Boats came off from the quays, led by Dixon in person. The fugitives were invited by mocking courtesy to disembark and return. Some were carried to the crowded gaol, some were forced on board a hulk, below the bridge which was converted into a prison ship.

THE BATTLE AT WEXFORD.

From the market a long, broad street ran parallel to the river, half way up the hill, and issued at the Three Bullet Gate, to which the road descended from Corbet Hill and Wexford. The rebel camp was a mile and a half distant, the troops were under arms all night. They were paraded at two in the morning, and as day began to break, the peculiar Irish cry was heard rising in gathering waves of sound in the direction of the camp. Nearer and nearer it came through the morning air. The rebels came on slowly and in enormous numbers. Scouts said they were not less than thirty thousand, and General Johnstone considered that "from the myriads which came down, they could not be much less. They marched in order, by parishes and by baronies!" The Dublin Regiment under Mountjoy, the dragoons, and other companies were drawn up outside the Three Bullet Gate, on open ground. The rebel masses bore down the hill towards them.

When a rifle shot off they halted. Priests were seen moving up and down the lines in their vestments, and carrying crucifixes. Mass was said at the head of every column, the men kneeling with marked and earnest devotion. For the moment Johnstone thought that they were hesitating, but was swiftly undeceived. It was now a little after three o'clock, daylight being scarcely yet fully established. They rose from their knees, the lines opened, and between them came

herds of wild cattle, rushing on amidst shouts and yells which burst from the enormous multitude, the rebels pricking them forward with their pikes. A fourth part of the rebel army had firearms, but their main strength was in the pikemen, who formed in line behind the cattle and charged with a fierceness of resolution for which the English and Scotch officers present were unprepared. They rushed upon the Dublin regiment, which was in some confusion, and drove it back through the gate. Mountjoy fell wounded, and was carried off into the insurgent lines. The dragoons charged, but without effect, and recoiled with loss. A gun was taken, and the rebel pikemen poured into the town after the retreating troops. According to their usual tactics, they instantly fired the houses. Cannon had been placed in the long straight street which leads from the market-place to the Bullet Gate, and poured round-shot and grape into their dense masses. Multitudes fell. An entire column was annihilated; not a man escaped out of it. Brave as they were, so terrible a reception startled them. They fell back for awhile, and the troops had time to rally and reform. But soon they came on, through smoke and flame, their courage and their overwhelming numbers compensating for want of discipline and inferiority of arms. Nor was the pike, in the hands of a strong, bold man a weapon to be lightly regarded. With a shaft twelve or fifteen feet in length, a long taper point—with a hook, at times, attached which would drag a horseman from his saddle—it was an overmatch, under some conditions, for the bayonet. Johnstone's advantage was in his heavy guns. The rebels had no artillerymen, and such cannon as they captured they were unable to use. Careless in their desperate fanaticism, the Irish showed for once in rebellion the contempt of danger, which as soldiers in the army of their sovereign, they never fail to show. Four guns were taken. They forced the troops backwards and downwards to the river, part into the market-place, where, as at Enniscorthy, the stone buildings became a fortress, which they could neither burn nor penetrate, part down over the bridge and into Kilkenny.

At one time they seemed to have won the day, and they would have won it could their leaders have restrained them in victory. But they turned uncontrollably to plunder, and incendiarism, and whisky, and discipline, resumed its superiority. Behind the river the broken troops again formed—Johnstone led them back to the charge, and the rebels, now scattered, were driven back in turn at the bayonet's point. The guns were recovered, and again began to work havoc in the disordered crowds. The carnage was now dreadful. No quarter had been given by the rebels at the beginning of the engagement—none was allowed them at the end of it. They were driven out through the gate at which they had entered. They attempted a stand within the lines where they first appeared in the morning. Johnstone stormed in upon them, and broke them. There Lord Mountjoy's body was found, far from the place where he had fallen, mangled and butchered in the most horrid manner. Mountjoy was the Luke Gardiner of '82, who had wrung from the Protestant Parliament the first concessions to the Catholics, and this was his reward. The sight of their commander thus brutally mutilated drove the Dublin regiment to fury. Three gentlemen had been murdered near Ross the day before with peculiar brutality. The Militia generally had behaved excellently in action, but when the fighting was over could be no longer restrained. Major Vesey says the carnage was now shocking; the troops were exasperate', and could not be stopped. The battle had raged for eleven hours. It began at four in the morning. At three in the afternoon, when it was at last over, Vesey estimated the rebel bodies which lay strewed round him as at least two thousand. Musgrave, on further inquiry, placed the number of those who were killed in the fight and after it at two thousand six hundred.

DEFEAT OF THE REBELS AT VINEGAR HILL.

At sunrise on the 21st of June the columns closed in upon the Irish camp. Dundas and Loftus' divisions came down the east bank of the Slaney, spread

over a front of almost a mile, and, as they approached the hill, formed round it at various points from the north to the south-east. Johnstone came up simultaneously from Ballymakessy. The rebels held Enniscorthy in force, and Johnstone's duty was to drive them out and take possession of the bridge before the general attack commenced. A second time within three weeks the little town of Enniscorthy became the scene of a desperate and bloody engagement. Only after two hours of severe fighting, Enniscorthy was taken, the bridge secured, and the rebel garrison forced back over it to their friends on the hill. It was now seven in the morning. The rebel army, sixteen thousand strong, was drawn up on the open ground on the brow. Their guns, thirteen in all, of various shapes and calibre, were at the windmill. General Lake, with Dundas, attacked on the east side; Sir James Duff, with part of Loftus' division, on the north-west, from the bank of the river. Loftus himself was between them. On these three sides they forced their way simultaneously up the slope. The rebels held their ground for an hour and a half with moderate firmness. Lake's horse was killed under him, early in the action. Father Clinch, of Enniscorthy, an enormous man, on a tall white horse, specially distinguished himself. But successive defeats had cooled the courage which had been so eminent at Arklow and New Ross. There was no longer the contempt of death, which will make even the least disciplined enemy formidable. Lord Roden singled out Father Clinch and killed him. The rebels were afraid of being surrounded, and, seeing the southern side of the hill still open, they fled down it, and escaped through Needham's Gap to Wexford from the scene of their brief and wild supremacy.

Father Roche was taken, tried by court martial, and hanged at the scene of the massacre on the bridge; John Hay, Father John's brother, General on Vinegar Hill, was hanged beside him. Special care was taken to make no distinctions on the score of religion. The Protestants concerned in the rebellion, though guiltless of a share in the murders, were more criminal in principle. Cornelius Grogan had an estate worth £10,000 a year. He had misjudged events, and had joined the insurgents to save it. He was found at his own house, brought in, tried by the same tribunal, and hanged also.

Bagenal Harvey and Colclough had disappeared. They had gone off in a boat to the larger of the Saltee Islands, Grogan's property which Colclough rented of him, and they hoped to lie concealed there till the storm was over. Some one betrayed their secret; and on the 23rd June Captain Willoughby was sent in the *Rutland* cutter to find them and bring them back. There was but one house in the island, and there were unmistakable signs of their recent presence, in the sheets upon the bed, and the clothes which were lying about the room. The cabin was searched, the Island was searched. They were not to be found. A boat had been seen stealing away when the cutter was approaching, and it was thought that they had escaped. As a last chance the cutter's gig was rowed round the island under the cliffs. One of the crew, watching narrowly, observed a place where the earth seemed to have been recently disturbed. They landed and discovered a cave, where the two gentlemen, with Colclough's wife, were lying concealed. They were carried back to Wexford, and sentenced to immediate death. Bagenal Harvey, Cornelius Grogan, and a wealthy citizen of Wexford, named Prendergast, were hanged on the 27th. Colclough suffered the same fate on the following date.

The insurgents who escaped with Father John over the Barrow, after ravaging part of Kilkenny, and finding the peasants, contrary to their expectation, disinclined to join them, doubled back into Wexford, and thence into the Wicklow mountains, where divided into roving gangs of murderous banditti, they protracted through the summer the bloody and miserable struggle. Father John, either separated from his companions by accident, or having designedly withdrawn from them, found his way in disguise to Taghmon, where he was recognised and arrested. When seized he struggled like a wild beast, but vengeance had overtaken him. After forty five years of hitherto inoffensive life he had become possessed with the

"Irish idea," and after one desperate month of murder, triumph, defeat, and ruin, he closed his career on the gallows on the 26th of June.

It is to preserve Ireland from Civil War and such horrible scenes as these:—Brutal massacre followed by retributive repression that the Unionist party appeal to the Nation.

DECLINE OF IRELAND

UNDER A SEPARATION PARLIAMENT, 1782 TO 1800.

In 1782, the separate and almost independent legislature, known as Mr. Grattan's Parliament, was granted to Ireland. The experiment was a most disastrous one. Ireland rapidly declined in trade, material prosperity, and social order under this separate Parliament. Finally, the bloody outbreak of 1798 consummated the proof of the failure of the Irish Parliament. The Union was then established by Mr. Pitt as the only remedy for the evils of Ireland.

The Irish Loyal Union published a very interesting pamphlet upon the relative prosperity of Ireland before and after the Union. From it much of the following facts are obtained. Tonnage and shipping belonging to Irish ports from 1788 to 1797 inclusive:—

	1788.	1792	1795	1797
Tons	60,776	69,567	58,778	53,181
No. of Ships ...	50 (1790)	42	33	19

The Irish tonnage, therefore, fell 12·5 per cent. between 1788 and 1797; and in the years 1798-99 together, the whole tonnage only amounted to 69,152 tons. The Irish shipbuilding fell off between 1794 and 1799 41·9 per cent.; and the tonnage of these ships 32·5 per cent.

IRISH EXPORTS FOR TWO PERIODS, viz. 1783 TO 1791, AND FROM 1792 TO 1798.

Years.	Grain, &c.			Tongues.	Wool.	Rape.	Kelp.	Tallow.
	Wheat.	Barley.	Meal.					
	barrels.	barrels.	cwts.	doz.	stones.	qrs.	tons.	cwts.
From 1785 to 1791	756,485	444,067	811,352	26,474	11,063	47,835	14,111	124,352
From 1792 to 1798	348,042	123,681	518,872	25,269	5,717	22,395	11,754	84,269
Decrease	408,443	320,386	292,480	1,205	5,346	25,440	2,357	40,083
Decrease per cent.	54·0	72·1	36·0	4·5	48·3	53·2	16·7	32·2

Years.	Calf Skins.	Linen Yarn.	Worsted Yarn.	Cows and Oxen.	Herrings.	Drapery.	Value of Foreign and Colonial Merchandise re-exported.
	doz.	cwts.	stones.	No.	barrels.	yards.	£
From 1785 to 1791	152,779	203,541	335,984	145,733	101,371	2,675,308	354,112
From 1792 to 1798	1320,80	129,415	210,896	134,523	18,605	1,254,736	331,380
Decrease	20,699	74,126	125,088	11,210	82,766	1,420,572	22,732
Decrease per cent.	13·5	36·4	37·2	7·7	81·6	53·1	6·4

The falling off, therefore, in Irish exports during the last five years of Grattan's Parliament exceeded 33 per cent. in all except five articles. In wheat, barley, and wool, the decline averaged over 50 per cent.

The following table will show the decline in the principal articles of luxury consumed in Ireland during the later years of Grattan's Parliament, as compared with the earlier:—

TABLE SHOWING DECLINE IN ARTICLES OF CONSUMPTION.

Sugar.		Wine.	Tobacco.		Malt.		Whisky.	
Period.	cwts.	Gallons.	Period.	lbs.	Period.	Barrels.	Period.	Gallons.
1788-1791	617,893	4,195,454	1791-1794	9,426,211	1791-1795	6,109,600	1798	4,783,954
1791-1794	567,215	3,069,606	1795-1799	5,376,172	1796-1800	5,619,782	1799	4,253,187
							1800	3,621,498
Decrease -	50,678	1,125,848	—	4,050,039	—	510,000	—	1,162,456
P're'ntage	8·9	26·8	—	43·0	—	9·0	—	24·3

The most extraordinary result of the separate Parliament in Ireland in 1782, was the enormous increase in the Irish National Debt. In 1791 that debt was £2,442.890, and the interest upon it was £142,716. In 1800 the debt had swollen to £25,662,640, and the interest £1,395,735. That is, the indebtedness of Ireland had increased tenfold.

It has been said that British policy discouraged and extinguished the native industries of Ireland. This cannot be proved, and it is the reverse of the fact. The closer connection with England and with English capital which the Union brought about was of great benefit to Ireland. Grattan's Parliament established an extensive system of bounties on Irish products. There were bounties on corn, flax, ships, silk, linen, and sugar. It is interesting to note that Mr. Parnell again proposes to artificially protect Irish industries. Notwithstanding the lavish bounties and the impulse of a separate legislature, trade and commerce in Ireland declined most conspicuously towards the end of the eighteenth century. Besides the proofs of this which have already been given, there remain on record a great number of petitions from corporations, manufacturers, merchants, and trade guilds, complaining of the decay in the state of trade, and the ruin of Irish commerce. The trade of Ireland at the time of the Union was in reality exceedingly small.

PROGRESS OF RELAND UNDER THE UNION.

A very great and remarkable increase in the commerce and prosperity of Ireland, as well as in social order, took place after the Union, and in consequence of it. This progress is best shown by dividing the time since the Act of Union in 1880 into two periods—the first from 1800 down to 1845—*i.e.*, before the marvellous development of trade by railways, steamships, telegraphs, increase of gold, &c., and the second from after the famine down to 1885. The years of the famine were, of course, exceptional, and cannot fairly be brought into a comparison of this kind. The same deplorable misfortune might happen to any purely agricultural country where there was an excessive population depending upon the soil. English and Scotch charity was certainly not slow to come to the aid of the Irish people in those terrible years. The following tables give some interesting facts:—

FIRST PERIOD 1800 TO 1845.

TONNAGE OF SHIPS OWNED AND REGISTERED AT IRISH PORTS in periods of Three Years prior and subsequent to the Union.

Years.	Tons.	Increase Per cent. over First Period,
1797-98-99	112,333	...
1824-25-26	225,766	101·0
1833-34-35	337,772	200·7
1843-44-45	631,981	462·6

NUMBER AND TONNAGE OF SHIPS BUILT IN IRELAND.

Decennial Periods.	No. of Ships Built.	No. of Tons.
From 1790 to 1799 inclusive ...	332	15,957
,, 1821 to 1830 ,, ...	415	20,733
Being an increase of the second period over the first of.....	83 ships	4,776 tons

And an increase per cent. of 25.0 in Ship-building and 29·9 Tonnage.

The returns after this are deficient.

TABLE OF THE IMPORTS AND EXPORTS OF IRELAND

Before and after the Union in two consecutive decennial periods.

Decennial Periods.	Value of Imports.	Value of Exports.
	£	£
From 1790 to 1801	49,396,254	51,322,620
From 1802 to 1813	74,511,058	63,483,718
Increase during the latter period (1802-13).....	25,114,804	12,161,098
Being an increase per cent. of.....	50·8 Imports	and 23·7 Exports.

ANNUAL AVERAGE VALUE OF IRISH EXPORTS AND IMPORTS

For Two Triennial Periods, one before and one after the Union, with their actual value in 1836.

Periods.	Value of Imports.	Value of Exports.
	£	£
Average for three years ending March, 1790	3,535,588	4,125,383
Average for three years ending January, 1826	7,491,890	8,454,918
Year 1836	15,337,097	17,394,813
Increase between first and last period	11,791,509	13,269,430
Increase per cent	333·5	321·7

The above table shows that the commerce of Ireland quadrupled within forty years after the Union.

GROWTH OF TRADE BETWEEN GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

Years.	Imports into Ireland from Great Britain.	Exports from Ireland to Great Britain.
	£	£
1801	3,270,350	3,537,725
1805	4,067,717	4,288,167
1809	5,316,557	4,588,305
1813	6,746,353	5,410,326
1817	4,722,766	5,696,613
1821	5,338,838	7,117,452
1825	7,048,936	8,531,355

This shows that the increase of imports was 115·5 per cent. and the increase of exports 141·1 per cent., within twenty-five years after the Union. After 1825 a separate record of Irish trade was no longer kept.

INCREASE IN STAPLE PRODUCTS OF IRELAND

In the Years 1800 (Union) and 1846.

	1800.	1846.	Increase per cent.
Amount of Wheat, Barley, Oats, and Meal exported from Ireland to Great Britain	500,000 qrs.	3,251,901	550
Export of Horned Cattle from Ireland to Great Britain	30,000	192,846	543
Export of Sheep	Scarcely any	259,257	—
,, Pigs	6,000	480,827	over 7,000

This enormous increase in the exportation of live stock is of the greatest importance to Ireland. In the period between 1800-1846 the increase in the export of Pigs increased nearly eighty-fold, as shown by above table.

INCREASE IN IRISH CONSUMPTION OF LUXURIES, giving four of the most important articles of comfort and luxury, between 1800 and 1845.

Period.	Tea.	Sugar.	Coffee.	Spirits.
	lbs.	cwts.	lbs.	gallons.
At the Union ...	1,700,000	200,000	150,000	3,000.000
In 1845	6,600.000	415,000	1,000,000	7,600.000
Increase in 1845.	4.900,000	215,000	850 000	4,600,000
Increase per cent.	288·2	107·5	566·7	153·3

A nation that can afford to consume and import the luxuries of life in such largely increasing quantities cannot be said to be growing poorer, or to be retrograding in any commercial sense. On the contrary, *Ireland vastly improved in material prosperity as a result of the Union.*

SINCE THE FAMINE—1852-1885.

Referring to the terrible years from 1846 to 1851, the writer of Part III. of "The Vindication of the Union" says:—

"There is no period, since the Union, at which the English connection proved of greater advantage to Ireland. Who, that remembers that awful time, can doubt that but for the active sympathy and assistance, both public and private, afforded by the English people, the sufferings of the poor in Ireland would have been immeasurably greater than they were? Speaking from personal knowledge, we can assert that for a great portion of the time during which the famine lasted *multitudes of persons, over large areas of the country, were indebted for their daily bread to the funds supplied from England, over and above the enormous grants by Parliament for their relief.* What they might have expected, had they been unhappily living under Home Rule, may be gathered from the experience of a similar calamity in 1740-1, the '*bliadhain an air*,' or year of slaughter, 'when the ordinary churchyards were not large enough to contain those who died by the road-side, or who were taken from the deserted cabins'; and when no measures were adopted either by the Legislature or the Executive to relieve the distress."

The same writer proceeds to state:—

"The Irish people are at this moment very far in advance of the condition of their ancestors at the time of the Union. They are better housed, better clad, better fed; they receive better price for the produce of their farms, and higher wages for their labour; they have greater liberty and better protection in health, abundant provision for sickness, and facilities for the education and advancement in life of their children, such as were undreamt of eighty years ago. No measure has been passed, since the

Union, for the benefit of the English or Scotch people in which they have not shared; and many Acts have been passed specially for their benefit which have not been extended to Scotland or England. These are facts which cannot be controverted, and which no one, except hireling agitators, would attempt to deny or distort. The depression in the prices of agricultural produce and the stagnation of trade are quite as keenly felt in England and Scotland as in Ireland—possibly more so—but we hear of no proposal to pull the Constitution to pieces as the only remedy for the distress. Orators preaching communistic doctrines may spout at debating clubs or hole-and-corner meetings; but they are not listened to by the mass of the English or Scotch people; they are not applauded in their National Press; they are not encouraged by their National Churches. It is only in Ireland that such doctrines find favour; it is only in Ireland that half-educated men, whose only qualification consists in fluency of speech, are accepted as economists and statesmen, whose utterances are to be received *ex cathedrâ* without question or proof."

SECOND PERIOD FROM 1852 TO 1885.

DEVELOPMENT OF IRISH COMMERCE FROM 1852 ONWARDS shown by the amount of shipping frequenting Irish ports during that period:—

Year.	Tonnage Inwards.	Tonnage Outwards.
1852	3,047,941	2,238,171
1884	6,723,269	6,578,578
Increase in 1885 over 1852.....	3,675,328	4,340,307
Increase per cent.	120·6	193·9

The above Table shows an aggregate increase of 151·6 per cent.—in other words, the shipping commerce of Ireland was two-and-a-half times as great in 1884 as it was in 1852.

In the same period the revenue of Great Britain increased in a ratio of 2 per cent. less than that of Ireland.

GROSS REVENUE OF IRELAND IN 1852 AND DEPOSITS 1885.

	1852.	1885.	Increase per cent.
	£	£	
Gross revenue of Ireland.....	4,414,413	7,770,626	76
Total of deposits and private balances in Irish Joint-Stock Banks.....	10,773,000	29,370,000	172·6

GROWTH OF DEPOSITS IN IRISH SAVINGS BANKS.

Class of Savings Bank.	1851.	1884.
	£	£
Trustee	1,347,617	2,119,264
Post Office	—	2,224,519
Total	1,347,617	4,343,783
Increase per cent.	—	244·6

The same writer says of these increased deposits:—

"An increase of 245 per cent. in the amount deposited in Irish Savings Banks is of itself a pretty conclusive proof of the growing prosperity of the humbler classes. The number of depositors in the Trustee Savings Banks has also risen from 49,554 in 1851 to 52,655 in 1884, an increase of 6·3 per cent.; and the average amount to the credit of each depositor from £27 3s. in 1851 to £40 5s. in 1884, an increase of 48·0 per cent. Meanwhile, the Post Office Savings Banks, which opened in 1862, have attracted the smaller depositors to the number of 124,973 in 1884, with an average balance of £17 16s. 6d. Combining the two classes of savings banks, we find no less than 177,628 depositors, in 1884, with an average balances of £24 10s. due to each, against 49,554, with an average balance of £27 3s. to credit in 1851. We have thus, in the thirty-three years, an increase of 152 per cent. in the number of depositors, and an increase of 245 per cent. in the aggregate amount lodged. Only 1 in 132 of the total population of Ireland was a depositor in a savings bank in 1851; while in 1884, 1 in every 28 had become a depositor."

It must not be supposed that the price of wheat or of barley has any practical influence upon agricultural property in Ireland. The Irish climate is not suited to wheat or to barley. The Irish wheat crop is a very small one. In 1885 only 71,000 acres out of 5,000,000 acres were under wheat, that is only 1·49 of the total cultivated acreage. The only really important cereal crop of Ireland is oats. There has been a decrease from 1852 to 1885 in the amount of acres cultivated under oats of 41·8 per cent.; but, on the other hand, the prices have increased by one-fifth, and the value of straw has greatly increased. The great increase, however, in Irish agricultural profits has been from the rearing of stock, which railways and steamers bring within reach of the British markets, and which more than compensates for the light fall in the value of oats.

INCREASE IN IRISH STOCK.

Black Cattle.	1852.	1885.	Increase.	Increase per cent.
Under 1 year old	600,763	981,041	380,278	65·5
1 year but under 2	621,287	881,741	260,454	41·9
Over 2 years old	1,873,017	2,365,969	492,952	26·3
Totals.....	3,095,067	4,228,751	1,133,684	36·6
Sheep	2,613,943	3,477,840	863,897	33·0
Pigs.....	1,072,658	1,269,122	196,464	18·3

The same authority says:—

"These increases of 37 per cent. in number of black cattle, 33 per cent. in the number of sheep, and 18 per cent. in the number of pigs in Ireland are of themselves sufficiently strong evidence of agricultural prosperity; but it is only by combining the increase in the numbers with the advance in prices, that the full extent of the improved position of the Irish farmers can be measured." The following Table will make this plain:—

VALUE OF IRISH STOCK.

Description.	Value in 1852.	Value in 1885.	Increase in Value.	Increase per cent.
	£	£	£	
Cattle.....	24,760,000	50,745,000	25,985,000	105·0
Sheep.....	3,529,000	6,086,000	2,557,000	72·5
Pigs.....	2,091,000	3,173,000	1,083,000	151·8
Totals	30,380,000	60,004,000	29,624,000	97·5

"The average prices above are estimated as follows:—Black cattle at £8 a piece in 1852, and at £12 in 1885; sheep at £1 7s. in 1852, and at £1 15s. in 1885; and pigs at £1 19s. in 1852, and at £2 10s. in 1885. These prices are the result of a wide and careful induction, and there has been an increase in value of over £29,000 000, amounting to 97·5 per cent. Potatoes and wool alone are cheaper now than they were in 1852.

"Manufactures also have made steady progress during the past thirty-three years. The linen trade of Ulster has attained very large proportions; and the manufacture of woollen goods has been established in several places in the other provinces. Irish friezes and Irish tweeds now compete successfully with the best productions of English and Scotch looms. Shipbuilding, also, has been successfully revived in Belfast."

An irrefragable proof that Ireland has advanced in material prosperity since 1852 may be drawn from the remarkable increase in the amount raised by excise duties in 1852 and 1885.

1582	1885	Increase per cent.
1,515,092	4,493,404	196·6

IMPROVEMENTS IN DWELLINGS.

A most remarkable progress has also taken place in the dwellings of the people, as the following table will show:—

Class of House Accommodation.	Number of Families		Increase + or Decrease-	Per Cent.
	1851.	1881.		
First Class ...	39,370	96,568	+ 57,198	125
Second Class...	292,280	467,387	+ 175,107	45
Third Class ...	588,440	390,094	-198.346	50
Fourth Class...	284,229	41,025	-243.204	700
Totals	1.204,319	995,074	-209,246	

"The classification of houses adopted by the Census Commissioners is as follows:—Fourth Class houses are built of mud and have only one room; Third Class houses are also built of mud, but have from two to four rooms and windows; Second Class houses consist of good farm or town houses, having from five to nine rooms and windows; First Class houses include all of a better description than those already specified.

"The returns prove that in 1851 there were in round numbers 873,000 families living in the poorer classes of house, or 72·3 per cent. of the whole, and only 27·7 per cent. occupying the two better classes of house; there were in 1881 only 43·3 per cent. living in the poorer classes of house, and 56·7 per cent. living in the better class; only 4·1 per cent. of the whole being housed in mud cabins."

The real need of Ireland is well stated in the following words:—

"The truth is that what Ireland wants is not legislation but Government, not new laws, but the steady enforcement of existing laws. The curse of the 'Irish people'—we use the word in its Parnellite sense—is that they look to Parliament for help in every difficulty, and Parliament, or, rather, the rival parties in Parliament, have much to answer for for encouraging this helpless spirit. Tried by every test, Ireland has advanced in prosperity since 1852. Her commerce is now two-and-a-half times greater than it was then. Her available capital, measured by the deposits in the banks, has increased two-and-three-quarter fold. Her revenue, in 1885, was one-and-three-quarter times as great as in 1852, and has increased

during the interval in a greater ratio than the revenue of the rest of the United Kingdom. The extent of her railway accommodation had been quadrupled. Oats, the only cereal crop cultivated to any extent, is now more profitable in the ratio of five to four. The cattle, sheep, and pigs, owned by the farmers of Ireland are now twice as valuable as the stock in their possession only thirty-three years ago. The excise duties levied last year were treble the amount paid in 1852, and the people are far better housed. When Ireland entered on her career of prosperity in 1852, she had not a third of the resources at her command that she has now."

In 1782 the sovereign remedy for which the people clamoured was applied—Home Rule was granted. Within ten years the country was the scene of lawlessness and outrage, not only in the provinces, but in the metropolis, under the very shadow of the Houses of Parliament; and *within sixteen years the people were in open rebellion. Then came the end.*

So sure as Parliament is led by any infatuation to sanction the revival of an Irish Parliament in any shape or form, so sure will the scenes of the closing years of the last century be re-enacted. Ireland will again become the theatre of outrage and crime, before which the worst days of the Land League will sink into insignificance. The "White Boys," the "Assassins," the "Tarring and Feathering Committees," the "Houghers," the "Defenders," the "Revolutionists," will again appear on the stage; they are only waiting till the strong hand of England is withdrawn to issue from their hiding places. *And then will come rebellion and civil war:* and, when thousands of lives and millions' worth of property have been destroyed, England will be compelled to conquer the country once more.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF IRELAND UNDER THE UNIONIST GOVERNMENT.

The great rise in prices since 1886 has similarly been due, for the most part, to a return of public confidence. In all cases prices are now much higher than in 1886; and this rise is as marked in cases where dividends are the same, or even in some instances lower, as where dividends are higher.

The deposits and cash balances in Joint Stock Banks in Ireland, which stood at £29,370,000 on December 31st, 1885, had risen in December, 1891, to no less than £34,532,000, the highest figure recorded, being considerably more than in 1876, which has been always regarded as the most prosperous year Ireland has ever seen, the amount of deposits and cash balances in that year having been £34,240,000.—(Parliamentary Return, 1892, C. 6612, and previous Returns.)

SAVINGS BANKS.

The following figures show the balances in Post-office and Trustee Savings Banks in Ireland, representing principally the savings of the humbler classes, at five-yearly intervals for the last twenty years.

BALANCES IN POST-OFFICE AND TRUSTEE SAVINGS BANKS.

Date.		Amount.
1871,	31st December,	£2,953,000
1876,	,,	3,277,000
1881,	,,	3,765,000
1886,	,,	4,710,000
1891,	,,	5,932,000

—C. 6612, and previous Returns.

It will be observed that the increase during the last five years has been considerably greater than in any other of the four quinquennial periods given above, and it is also greater than in any other similar period during the last fifty years.

On the other hand, the amount of Government and Indian Stocks held in Ireland has fallen from £29,689,000 *on the* 31*st of December*, 1885, *to* £25,784,000 *on the* 31*st of December*, 1891, a decrease of £3,905,000. There has, however, for many years, been an almost continuous decrease in the amount of Government Stock held in Ireland, and in the five most prosperous years, ending the 31st of December, 1876, there was a decrease of £3,825,000, or almost exactly the same amount of decrease as in the past five years.

It should be recollected that the funded National Debt has been reduced during the past ten years by nearly one-fifth, and during the past five years by nearly one-tenth. It would, therefore, be natural to expect that Irish investments in the National Debt should be reduced in similar proportion.

The process of transferring investments from the Government Funds to other Securities has during the past three years been stimulated on the one hand by the reduction in the rate of interest on Consols, and on the other hand by the power conferred on Trustees by the Trust Investment Act of 1889, of investing Trust funds in various other more remunerative securities. Accordingly we find that during the past three years the decrease in

Irish investments in Government and Indian Stocks has been £2,885,000, which is quite beyond the ordinary rate of decrease.

It is a rather curious fact that in the exceptionally bad years of 1879 and 1886, Irish investments in the funds increased, in the former year by £603,000, and in the latter year by £391,000. The fact is the more remarkable as regards 1886, because during that year the Liquidators of the Munster Bank, which stopped payment in 1885, sold £600,000 of Consols to provide cash for distribution amongst the creditors of the bank. It is probable that in times of exceptional want of confidence investors sell out of ordinary securities and invest in the funds.

In the regular course of events a large proportion of Irish savings are annually invested in securities out of Ireland, and there is reason to believe that during recent years the amount so invested has been unusually large. The uncertainty as to the future government of Ireland has naturally tended to increase the desire of Irish people to spread their investments over a wider area rather than risk all their savings in home securities.

In connection with the foregoing observations it is important to note that during the six years since 1886, a number of large manufacturing and mercantile businesses in Ireland have been transferred from the ownership of private firms to that of Limited Liability Companies. The Capital of thirteen of these Companies, including that of A. Guinness, Sons & Co., but not including any brought out in Belfast, or any whose Capital was less than £100,000, amounts to about Ten Millions Sterling.*

---

*New Companies :—

A. Guinness, Sons & Co.	£6,000,000
A. Thom & Co.	207,000
Bolands	280,000
Castlebellingham and Drogheda Breweries ...	265,000
Dublin City and Banagher Distillery	150,000
Dublin Distillers	1,000,000
E. & J. Burke (1)	800,000
Ferrier, Pollock & Co.	100,000
"Freeman's Journal"	110,000
H. Denny & Sons (1)	400,000
Johnston, Mooney & O'Brien	200,000
Kinahan & Co.	210,000
Pim Brothers (2)	250,000
	£9,972,000

(1) Only the Preference Shares in these Companies have been issued to the public.
(2) Re-constructed in 1889, since when the shares have been put upon the market.

No doubt a large proportion of the shares and debentures in these companies still remains in the hands of the vendors, but the greater proportion has been absorbed by the general investing public in Ireland. The shares of most of these companies now stand in the market at a substantial premium, so that the ten millions is now worth, at market prices, over seventeen millions.

The absorption of the capital of these Irish companies taking place simultaneously with extensive investments by Irish people in new companies brought out in England and America, and a great increase in the deposits in the Irish Banks, and in the Post Office and Trustee Savings' Banks, is most conclusive proof of the rapid growth of capital throughout Ireland during the past sixyears.

RAILWAY RECEIPTS.

The total railway receipts, which in 1881 were £2,601,000, and in 1886 £2,751,000, in 1891 amounted to £3,146,000, the highest annual amount recorded in Ireland.

DECREASE OF POPULATION.

It is sometimes assumed that the fact that the population of Ireland has decreased during the last forty-five years is a proof of the absence of prosperity. *The population at the time of the Union has been estimated at* 5,299,000 (Thom's *Official Directory*), and in 1846 it had increased to 8,288,000, according to the estimate given in the returns of the Registrar-General. "Prior to 1846," says Dr. Grimshaw, "the potato bore exactly the same relation to the population of Ireland that rice does to the population of several districts of India at the present day, and the famine of 1847 and consequent diminution of the population, was due to the failure of the potato crop." Dr. Grimshaw, however, is careful to point out that emigration does not necessarily mean decay; he thinks "the want of sufficient emigration before the Irish Crisis was the cause of great, rapid, and unexampled decay which has only been stayed by emigration."—(*A Statistical Survey of Ireland from* 1840 *to* 1888 By T. W. Grimshaw, M.A., M.D., Reg.-Gen. for Ireland.)

DECREASE IN RATE OF EMIGRATION FROM 1886 TO 1890.

The rate of emigration has, however, naturally been less in the more prosperous years, and has fallen during the period 1886–1890, as

compared with the preceding five years. Thus the average decrease in the estimated population each year, from 1881 to 1885, was 56,000, and from 1885 to 1890, 47,000; the average rate of emigration per 1,000 of the estimated population in the former period having been 16·5, and in the latter, 14·9.

The number of Emigrants in 1879 *was* 47,065, *in* 1883 *the figures had risen to* 108,724. *In* 1885 *the number had fallen to* 62,034, but had risen again in 1887 to 82,923, since when there has been a steady decline in Emigration, the number in 1891 having been 59,623.

THE HOUSING OF THE PEOPLE.

The following Table, furnished by the reports of the Irish Census, shows the great improvement which has taken place in the housing of the people of Ireland. The fourth class of houses includes all single roomed houses; the third, a better class, with from two to four rooms; the second a good farm-house, or small town-house, with five to seven rooms; and the first class all houses of a better description than the preceding.

TABLE SHOWING THE NUMBER OF FIRST, SECOND, THIRD, AND FOURTH CLASS OF INHABITED HOUSES.

Census Periods.	First Class.	Second Class.	Third Class.	Fourth Class.	Total.
1841	40,080	264,184	533,297	491,278	1,328,839
1851	50,164	318,758	541,712	135,589	1,046,223
1861	55,416	360,698	489,668	89,374	995,156
1871	63,483	381,114	363,042	156,741	961,380
1881	66,727	422,241	384,475	40,665	914,108
1891	70,740	466,632	312,589	20,617	870,578

Thus, while the number of first and second class houses have increased, the third and fourth class have diminished.

The following Table shows the number of families occupying the different classes of house-accommodation.

Years.	Number of Families Occupying Accommodation of the				
	1st Class.	2nd Class.	3rd Class.	4th Class	Total.
1841	31,333	241,664	574,386	625,356	1,472,739
1851	39,370	292,280	588,440	284,229	1,204,319
1861	44,302	333,440	553,496	197,062	1,128,300
1871	49,693	357,752	432,774	227,379	1,067,598
1881	57,673	403,862	443,247	90,292	995,074
1891	62,613	454,870	359,308	55,322	932,113

Thus, while the total number of families in Ireland has declined from 1,472,739 in 1841, to 932,113 in 1891, the number of families occupying house-accommodation of the first and second class respectively, has nearly doubled, and the number of those occupying house-accommodation of the third and fourth classes have very largely decreased.

The Registrar-General states, in his "Statistical Survey of Ireland," already referred to, that a somewhat different plan of tabulation was adopted in 1871, which accounts for the apparent increase of the fourth class houses, and of the number of families with fourth class accommodation, in that year.

PAUPERISM DECREASING.

The total number of paupers in receipt of indoor and outdoor relief has decreased every year since 1886, the number in that year having been 633,000 and the cost £904,000 as compared with 455,000 relieved in 1890, at a cost of £856,000.

The average daily number of persons receiving indoor relief in the year 1881–82 was 52,772; in 1886–87, 45,889; and in 1890–91, 41,793; the average daily number receiving out-door relief in the same years being 60,196, 78,241, and 62,235 respectively. The very large increase in out-door relief in 1886 was caused by the gross maladministration, by the Boards of Guardians, of Mr. Morley's grant of £20,000 in the six poorest

unions in the West of Ireland, the number of persons on the list of those in receipt of out-door relief in some cases exceeding the population of the district.

The average annual cost of pauperism in the first half of the decade 1881–1890 was £962,000, and in the latter half £864,000.

According to the figures given in the *Financial Reform Almanac* for 1892, the average number of paupers in England and Wales in the five years 1885 to 1889 was 28 per 1000 of the estimated population, in Scotland 24, and in Ireland 23 per 1000; the average annual cost of pauperism per head of the population in the same period being 6s. in England, 4s. 6d. in Scotland, and 4s. 4d. in Ireland.

INCREASE OF LIVE STOCK.

There is, perhaps, with the exception of the figures as to joint-stock and savings banks, which have been already quoted, no more remarkable test of the material prosperity of Ireland than the increase in the number of live stock.

The following are the figures for 1881, 1886, and 1891, respectively:—

TABLE SHOWING THE NUMBER OF LIVE STOCK IN 1881 AND 1891.

Year.	Horses & Mules.	Asses.	Cattle.	Sheep.	Pigs.	Goats.	Poultry.
1881	573,980	187,356	3,954,479	3,258,583	1,088,041	266,553	13,965,760
1886	578,299	196,245	4,183,924	3,366,043	1,263,142	266,176	13,909,822
1891	621,501	216,268	4,448,477	4,722,391	1,367,776	336,257	15,216,543

It will be observed that in every class of live stock, with the exception of pigs, the increase has been far greater in the years 1886–1891 than in the preceding quinquennial period.

VALUE OF LIVE STOCK.

The following Table shows the value of live stock in Ireland at decennial periods from 1841 to 1881, and also in 1886 and 1891, at the prices assumed by the Census Commissioners of 1841:—

namely, horses and mules £8 each; asses £1; horned cattle £6 10s.; sheep £1 2s.; pigs £1 5s.; goats 7s. 6d.; and poultry 6d.

Years.	Amount.
1841	£21,105,808
1851	27,737,395
1861	33,434,385
1871	37,515,211
1881	35,847,311
1886	37,747,278
1891	41,514,236

The prices of the different descriptions of live stock have risen very much as compared with those taken as average prices in 1841; and the actual value of the live stock in Ireland is therefore far more than is represented by the above figures. Even taking those figures, however, the increase of wealth in live stock is over £20,000,000 in 1891, as compared with 1841.

It is true there has been a diminution both in the quantity and value of cereal crops, owing to the fall in the prices of grain, but the loss arising from this source is small as compared with the enormous increase in live stock.

The value of the horses, cattle, sheep, and pigs in Ireland, according to a new rate of valuation, is put down in "Thom's Official Directory" as £63,099,500 in 1886; and £68,247,199 in 1891, instead of £41,000,000 according to the old rate of valuation, the value of the asses, goats, poultry, &c., being, moreover, included in the £41,000,000 though not in the new valuations for 1886 and 1891.

TEXTILE INDUSTRIES.

The following figures, taken from the Statistical Abstract, show that there has been a considerable advance in the textile industries of Ireland :—

Year.	Number of Spinning Spindles.	Number of Doubling Spindles.	Number of Power Looms.
1885	963,031	30,875	25,472
1890	970,119	46,092	28,612

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT.

There has also been a very large increase in the business transacted by the Post-Office Department in Ireland.

The following Table gives some of the principal figures, 000 being omitted :—

Year.	Letters Delivered.	Book Packets and Circulars.	Telegrams Forwarded.	Money Orders.		Postal Orders.	
				Issued.	Paid.	Issued.	Paid.
				£	£	£	£
1881	82,238	14,164	1,862	1,274	1,729	90	94
1885	89,700	17,800	2,224	1,135	2,009	484	461
1890	99,859	24,545	3,634	1,360	2,256	884	880

SPIRITS AND BEER.

Finally, the number of gallons of spirit distilled during the year 1881 was 9,407,000; in 1886, 10,627,000, and in 1890, 12,989,000, an increase of 38·1 per cent. as compared with 1881. The number of barrels of beer (including porter) brewed in Ireland in 1881 was 1,920,000; in 1886, 2,150,000, and in 1890, 2,490,000, an increase of 29·1 per cent. as compared with 1881.

BRITISH STATESMEN ON HOME RULE.

MR. GLADSTONE.

Mr. Gladstone, on receiving the freedom of the City of Aberdeen, on the 26th September, 1871, dealt specially with the Home Rule question, and said :—

"This United Kingdom, which we have endeavoured to make a united kingdom in heart as well as in law—(applause)—we trust will remain a united kingdom—(loud applause)—and although as human beings the issues of great events are not in our hands, but are directed by a higher Power, yet we intend and mean, every one us both high and low—not those merely who meet in this hall, but those who crowd the streets of your city, and every city from the north to the south of this island—we intend that it shall remain a united kingdom. (Loud applause.)

. . . . . .

"We are told that it is necessary for Ireland to close her relations with the Parliament of this country, and to have a Parliament of her own. Why is Parliament to be broken up? Has Ireland any great grievances? What is it that Ireland has demanded from the Imperial Parliament, and that the Imperial Parliament has refused? (Cheers.) It will not do to deal with this matter in

vague and shadowy assertions. I have looked in vain for the setting forth of any practical scheme of policy which the Imperial Parliament is not equal to deal with, or which it refuses to deal with, and which is to be brought about by Home Rule.

. . . . . .

"Has Ireland great grievances? What is it that Ireland has demanded from the Imperial Parliament, and that the Imperial Parliament has refused? (Cheers.) It will not do to deal with this matter in vague and shadowy assertions. I have looked in vain for the setting forth of any practical scheme of policy which the Imperial Parliament is not equal to deal with, or which it refuses to deal with, and which is to be brought about by Home Rule. I have seen nothing, except that it is stated there is a vast quantity of fish in the seas that surround Ireland, and that *if they had Home Rule they would catch a great deal of these fish.* But there are fish in the seas which surround England and Scotland. England has no Home Rule, and Scotland has no Home Rule, but we manage to catch the fish. (Cheers, and laughter.) You would expect when it is said that the Imperial Parliament is to be broken up—you would expect that at the very least a case should be made out, showing that there were great subjects of policy and great demands necessary for the welfare of Ireland, which the representatives of Ireland had united to ask, and which the representatives of England, Scotland, and Wales had united to refuse. (Applause.) There is no such sentiment. There is nothing that Ireland has asked and that this country and that this Parliament has refused. *This Parliament has done for Ireland what it would have scrupled to do for England or for Scotland.* (Cheers.)

. . . . . .

"What are the inequalities of England and Ireland? I declare that I know none, except that there are *certain taxes* still remaining which *are* levied over Englishmen and Scotchmen, and which *are not* levied over Irishmen; and likewise that there are certain purposes for which public money *is* freely and largely given in Ireland, and for which *is not* given in England or Scotland. (Cheers.) That seems to me to be a very feeble case indeed for the argument which has been used, by means of which, as we are told, the fabric of the united Parliament of this country is to be broken.

. . . . . .

"There is no doubt that, if the doctrines of Home Rule are to be established in Ireland, I protest on your behalf that you will be just as well entitled to it in Scotland. (Hear, hear.) And, moreover, I protest on behalf of Wales, in which I live a good deal, and where there are eight hundred thousand people who to this day—such is their sentiment of nationality—speak hardly anything but their own Celtic tongue—a larger number than speak the Celtic tongue, I apprehend, in Scotland, and a larger number than speak it, I apprehend, in Ireland. I protest on behalf of Wales that they are entitled to Home Rule there. (Applause.) *Can any sensible man, can any rational man, suppose at this time of day—in this condition of the world—we are going to disintegrate the great capital institutions of this country for the purpose of making ourselves ridiculous in the sight of all mankind, and crippling any power we possess for bestowing benefits through legislation on the country to which we belong?*

Speaking at Dalkeith, on November 27th 1879, Mr. Gladstone said:—

"In England circumstances occurred which drew the attention of the people to the Irish Church. I had, in 1865, said I believed it was out of the range of practical politics. Now it came to this—that a goal in the heart of the metropolis

was broken open in circumstances which drew the attention of the English people to the state of Ireland ; and when in Manchester a policeman was murdered in the execution of his duty, at once the whole country became alive to the question of the Irish Church—it came within the range of practical politics."

. . . . . .

"There is one limit, and one only, to the extension of local government ; it is this—nothing can be done by any wise statesman, or rightminded Briton, to weaken or compromise the authority of the Imperial Parliament. The Imperial Parliament must be supreme in these three kingdoms, and nothing that creates a doubt upon that supremacy can be tolerated by any intelligent or patriotic mind. (Cheers.)

. . . . . .

"I will consent to give to Ireland no principle, nothing that is not to be given on equal terms to Scotland, and to different parts of the kingdom." (Cheers.)

Mr. Gladstone at Edinburgh, in a speech at the Liberal Club, on April 1st, 1880, expressed the following opinion of Ireland after six years of Lord Beaconsfield's administration :—

"There was a great deal of difficulty still to contend with in the state of Ireland ; but as to those panics and apprehensions of fear that the people of Ireland wanted to tear Ireland away from its connection with this country, he told them frankly that he did not believe that ; he thought it was an old woman's apprehension—(laughter)—not that he meant to apply the phrase 'old woman' to any person, but to apply it strictly—as qualifying the character of the apprehension."

. . . . . .

"Speaking generally, the cultivation of Ireland has been carried on for the last eight years under cover and shelter of the land law in Ulster, and the North, and the other three provinces in Ireland, with a sense of security on the part of the occupier—with a feeling that he was sheltered and protected by the law, instead of feeling that he was persecuted by the law. There is an absence of crime and outrage with a general sense of comfort and satisfaction such as is unknown in the previous history of the country."

At JUNIPER GREEN, March 22nd, 1880.

"Mr. Gladstone then proceeded to animadvert on a handbill issued to the electors of Southport, calling on them to vote for Colonel Blackburn and Mr. Secretary Cross, who were prepared to maintain 'one Queen, one Parliament, and one Empire.' (Laughter.) They were being intimidated by being told that the Liberals of this country were not prepared to support Queen, Parliament, and Empire. It was intended to insinuate that the Liberals were disposed to break down the authority of Parliament by fostering the Home Rule movement. There was not a shadow of evidence to be produced in support of the charge."

At EDINBURGH, November 9th, 1885.

"From one end of Great Britain to the other I trust there will not be a single representative returned to Parliament who, for one moment, would listen to any proposition tending to impair the visible and sensible Empire—the unity of the Empire. Whatever demands may be made on the part of Ireland, if they are to be entertained, they must be subject to the condition that the unity of the Empire shall be preserved, and that all the authority of Parliament—of the Imperial Parliament—which is necessary for maintaining the unity of the Empire, shall be steadfastly maintained.

. . . . . .

"Let me now suppose that the Liberal party might be returned to the coming Parliament—that is rather a staggering supposition—(laughter)—but I beg you to

indulge me for an instant—(laughter)—might be returned to the coming Parliament in a minority, but in a minority which might become a majority by the aid of the Irish vote ; I will suppose that owing to some cause the present Government has disappeared, and a Liberal party was called to deal with this great constitutional question of the Government of Ireland in a position where it was a minority dependent on the Irish vote for converting it into a majority. Now, gentlemen, I tell you seriously and solemnly, that though I believe the Liberal party to be honourable, patriotic, and trustworthy, in such a position as that it would not be safe for it to enter on the consideration of a measure in respect to which, at the first step of its progress, it would be in the power of a party coming from Ireland to say, 'Unless you do this and unless you do that we will turn you out to-morrow.' (Cheers.)

. . . . . .

"We believe it is essential for the public welfare that the party which may have to deal with Mr. Parnell, or to check and virtually govern the dealings with Mr. Parnell, should be a party not dependent upon his suffrages."

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT.

In December, 1885, speaking at Lowestoft, Sir. W. Harcourt professed the greatest indignation at the alleged alliance between the Conservative party and the Nationalists. The charge was false; but Sir William Harcourt's fury is very interesting in view of his present attitude, and he said that a Parnellite alliance would not be tolerated by this country.

"The Tories propose to govern the country by an intimate alliance with men who openly avowed their object was the dismemberment of Ireland from England. Was it possible the country was going to tolerate such a transaction ? Liberals must not be in a hurry to turn the Tories out. He would let them for a few months stew in their own Parnellite juice, and when they stank in the nostrils of the country, as they would stink, then the country would fling them, discredited and disgraced, to the constituencies, and the nation would pronounce its final judgment upon them. They would hear no more of Tory reaction for many generations."

Speaking on the University Education (Ireland) Bill, Sir William demonstrated why Home Rule should not be granted (*Hansard*), Vol. 214, p. 1,618:—

"If we are to govern Ireland according to Irish ideas, I fear we shall find ourselves reduced to the consequence of not governing Ireland at all. . . . . For myself, not being a 'Home Ruler,' I have never adopted the idea of governing Ireland according to Irish ideas. I have always regarded Ireland as a part of Her Majesty's dominions—as an integral fraction of a united empire—and if that be so, Ireland, like all other parts of the dominions of the Queen, must be governed not according to Irish, but according to Imperial ideas. Imperial ideas are exactly opposite, so far as I can judge, to Irish ideas. The House of Commons has not to consider whether a measure squares with Irish ideas, or satisfies the demands of any section of the Irish people, but whether it is consistent with equal justice ; and having matured such a measure, it is our duty to offer it for acceptance by the Irish people, leaving to those who reject it the responsibility of that refusal."

MR. JOHN BRIGHT.

Mr. Bright expressed himself with equal decision in a letter written in 1872. The letter was addressed to The O'Donoghue, then candidate for Kerry, in opposition to the candidate chosen by the Home Rulers:—

"My dear O'Donoghue,—It is said some persons engaged in the canvass of the County of Kerry have spoken of me as an advocate of what is termed Home Rule in Ireland. I hope no one will venture to say anything so absurd and untrue. If it has been said by anyone of any authority in the county, I will feel obliged if you contradict it. *To have two representative Legislative Assemblies or Parliaments in the United Kingdom would, in my opinion, be an intolerable mischief*, and I think no sensible man can wish for two within the limits of the present United Kingdom, who does not wish the United Kingdom to become two or more nations entirely separate from each other. Excuse my troubling you with this. It is no duty of mine to interfere with your contest, but I do not wish to be misrepresented." And in his memorable address to the electors of Birmingham in June, 1886, Mr. John Bright used these striking words.

EARL SPENCER.

Speaking at BRISTOL, November 14, 1881 :—

"What we have to do is this—we have to tell the Irish that their just grievances always will be redressed ; that we will extend to them every privilege and liberty that we Englishmen possess ; but we must tell them plainly at the same time, that no party in England, whether Conservative or Liberal, will put up with anarchy ; and, what is more, that they are beating the air if they agitate for repeal of the Union. (Cheers.) We hold that the continued union of Ireland with this country is of vital importance to us. We feel like the Americans when the integrity of their country was threatened, and, if necessary, we must shed blood to maintain the strength and salvation of this country. (Hear, hear.)"

At BELFAST, June 18th, 1884.

"The deeds of those men to whom I referred will, however, be as futile as they are dastardly. They will not terrify the English nation. The statesmen of the nation, and the nation itself, will face their enemy with a determination not to be beaten, and they will not give up one point or one idea which they consider necessary to maintain the United Parliament of England—(cheers)—and the sovereignty of the Queen. (Cheers.) I say this, not only to the English and Scottish nation, but I say it to the Irish nation."

SIR GEORGE TREVELYAN.

Sir George Trevelyan was a Unionist during the General Election of 1886, although after his defeat at the Border Boroughs, he apostasised and be came a Separatist and Gladstonian. The speeches of Sir George Trevelyan are a perfect mine for quotations in support of the Crimes Act, or against the Coercion of the League.

Speaking at Hawick on February 10th, 1883, Sir George Trevelyan said :—

"If you want to get at the truth, you must never forget that *there are two Irelands*—the Ireland of men of all parties, and creeds, and ranks, and callings, who, whatever else they differ upon, unite in wishing to preserve law and order, and the right of every citizen to go about his business in peace and safety ; and there is the other Ireland—the smaller Ireland, as I firmly believe—of the men who foment and condone and sympathise with crime. *It is the gravest mistake to underrate the numbers and the claim to respect of the party of order in Ireland. It is not a political party.* (Hear, hear.) It includes the great Liberal party of the north which, in its essential features, resembles the Liberal party in Scotland.

"*I never came across men more ready, at a crisis, cheerfully and unostentatiously to place patriotism before party than the Conservatives of the sister island.*

"*The party of order includes every farmer who does not want to rob the landlord of his due*, and who does not want to be forced to pay blackmail to agitation—*every poor fellow who desires to be at liberty to earn a day's wages*, by whoever they are offered him, without being shunned, insulted, beaten, and, too probably, murdered."

Speaking at Snitterford, Warwickshire, on Dec. 30th, 1885:—

"Now there is one point which in the coming controversy men ought to fix quite clearly in their minds, and that is, that as far as law and order, and the peace of the country are concerned, *there is no half-way house between entire separation and Imperial control.*

"Unless we are prepared to give the control of the police to the central authority in all its departments we had better go in at once for the Repeal of the Union.

"It is proposed to give Ireland a Parliament of its own for Irish legislation, but to admit Irish representatives to the Imperial Parliament to discuss and vote upon Imperial matters. . . . . However anxious we may be to divide the domestic functions of Parliament from its Imperial functions, I will venture to say *that Irish members will not only be absolute masters of their own Parliament in Dublin, but they would be our masters at Westminster as well.*"

Speaking in the House of Commons on April 8th, 1886, Sir G. Trevelyan said:—

"*A confession that the Liberal Party was a Home Rule Party*—that confession—I speak with all respect for those who feel otherwise—is one which, until every faculty I have is strained to the uttermost, and every constitutional method inside and outside the House has been exhausted, *I, for one, will never consent to.*

"*I have the greatest possible respect for existing Irish judges.* They have done their duty under circumstances of the very greatest difficulty. Such was the tremendous moral pressure upon them, such, in some cases, was the physical danger—such was the terrible vituperation and calumny to which they were subjected, that we used to consider it was only a very brave judge who would do his duty under the most trying circumstances.

"*That any responsible body of Ministers, whatever else they did, should put the keeping of the police, the enforcement of civil obligations, and the safety and property of our fellow citizens throughout Ireland in the hands of an elective Irish Parliament I could not believe.*

"Why did Lord Spencer leave such a very hateful memory? I should imagine the reason was that he vindicated law and order.

"I cannot consent to the wholesale surrender of our hold upon law and order, which we should never be able to get again. This is the first point upon which I left the Cabinet.

"It is said that an Irish Parliament will be unable to hamper the English Parliament because it will be strictly limited in the subjects it can discuss. Sir, how can you limit any Parliament, let alone a Parliament in a country which has produced such men as Wolf Tone, O'Connell, Sheil, and John Mitchell? *Separation is preferable to such a course.*"

Speaking at Harwich on May 5th, 1886, Sir George Trevelyan said:—

"*The Inquisition into the conduct of Jurymen at an Irish trial has always been most searching.* One very well-known gentleman in the South of Ireland sat on a Jury on an Agrarian crime. He was among those who were for a conviction. The Jury disagreed; the prisoner was not punished; but this gentleman was none the less a marked man, and he was murdered.

"*The poor, the helpless, the uninfluential*, the farmers and labourers throughout the South and West of Ireland, who, at a terrible risk to life and limb, insisted on fulfilling their legal obligations; the smaller and humbler officers of the law, who did their duty through the bad times, *will now be left to the mercy of those who have not concealed their intention of paying them out whenever they can get a chance.*

"The real meaning of what has occurred is, that *the Government have obtained the Parnellite vote* by losing the support of a good many more of their most faithful and tried supporters in the House of Commons.

"*I will not be a party to giving them* [*the Irish*] *the uncontrolled care of law and order.*

"Nothing but the fact that the police and resident magistrates were in the hands of a strong central government *preserved certain districts in the South and West of Ireland from wholesale massacre.*

"*What is called coercion was merely the putting in force the steps which are required to ensure conviction* and to carry out the ordinary law.

"They set up a separate Executive, and they know that this *Executive will be composed of members of the Land League who have been teaching that rent is robbery.*

"For my own part the idea of making the ex-members of the Land League the land agents in Ireland of the British Treasury is the wildest that ever entered the brain of man.

"Scotland is much less well off than Ireland, which is a sort of spoiled child."

Speaking at Harwich on July 2nd, 1886, Sir G. Trevelyan said:—

"If I had supported that scheme after what I said to you in November last, all I can say is that, though you might have been willing to elect me, I never should have ventured to look you in the face again.

"I could quote by the hundred passages of extraordinary violence and impropriety which were spoken by leading members of the Land League during the recent troubles—*passages which would prove, as I think, that they are unfit now to be entrusted with law and order.*"

MR. JAMES BRYCE.

The Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, who is now an ardent advocate for a separate Parliament for Ireland, has gone through the same remarkable change of views that most of his colleagues have undergone. Mr. James Bryce wrote an article in the *Century Magazine* for June, 1883, under the title of "England and Ireland," from which the following is an extract:—

"On the other hand, England cannot bring herself to accept the social revolution, and to let the numerical majority of Irishmen carry out their will, whatever that may prove to be, for England holds herself responsible for whatever happens in Ireland. *If Ireland were cut adrift, a civil war might possibly have to decide the issue* between the aboriginal nation and the Anglo-Scottish or Protestant colony, or rather (since the distinction of Parties does not closely follow the difference of blood) between the tenants and labourers of the S.W. and the upper classes. Whichever faction triumphed, whether by arms or by votes, would abuse its power and trample on the rights of the other. England feels unable to tolerate this. If Ireland were left independent, and a civil war followed, *England could not stand by and see excesses like those of the Communards and the Assembly at Paris of* 1871 *without interfering.* If, a connection of the countries being maintained, domestic Irish legislation were committed to an Irish Parliament, and that Parliament used it to dispossess landowners without compensation, and establish the Roman Catholic Church, England would be irresistably moved to interefere. *Therefore she clings to the idea that the United Kingdom is one*, and when the idea presents itself of cutting Ireland adrift, asks whether that would not be treason to those inhabitants of Ireland who do belong to the British rather than to the Irish nation, and to whom her faith seems so deeply plighted."

LORD ROSEBERY.

Lord Rosebery thus described, at Plymouth, in May, 1887, the plan now adopted by the Cabinet:—

"Nothing could more effectually condemn the retention of the Irish members.

"Suppose you give the Irish members a Parliament of their own for their own affairs, and give them at the same time their present representatives in the Imperial Parliament, then you put them in a vastly preponderant and superior position, because they have not merely the exclusive right to manage their own affairs but they have also a very considerable right in the management of ours. This is a great disturber of the balance of the Constitution, and that, on the whole, seems to be undesirable. But, on the other hand, if you say, as many have said: 'We will admit the Irish member, but only for Imperial matters'—what are you to do with the Irish members when Imperial matters are not going on? *Is the Speaker to ring the bell and say, 'The Irish members may come in'*—(laughter)—*and then some English member who objected to the Irish members will say, 'Sir, I object to the Irish members coming in; this is not an Imperial matter,' and we shall have a debate, perhaps, of two nights as to whether or not it is an Imperial matter, and the Irish members may come in*—(laughter)—and then, just in the middle of question time or at the end of any debate you may find the Speaker ringing his bell again and saying, 'The Irish members will please return to their own quarters,' and you will have these unfortunate Irish members in a state of perpetually suspended and restored animation. (Laughter.)

"This is what the Government propose. It is a perfect scheme for ensuring waste of time and confusion at Westminster."

LORD ROSEBERY ON A NATIONALIST ALLIANCE.

Speaking at Paisley on the 15th of October, 1885, Lord Rosebery said in connection with the alleged alliance between the Tories and the Irish Nationalists:—

"The engagement has been only sealed so far; it has not been ratified. We shall have to pay for the ratification. The followers of Mr. Parnell do not give votes for nothing. I fear the result will be disastrous. Try and imagine to yourselves the future of this country governed by Mr. Parnell and Lord Randolph Churchill—(ironical laughter)—on the principle which Prince Bismarck calls *do ut des*—'give that you may give'—on the principle of 'scratch me and I will scratch you.' (Laughter.) We may be certain that it is not England, or Scotland, or Wales that will benefit by this new and interesting alliance. (Cheers.) Now, that is a grave prospect that the electors should weigh. I am not the least apprehensive about the Protective duties, but what is proposed is this, as I understand it—that Ireland should be treated as a colony, and that the Crown should be the only link between Ireland and the mother country. Well, it is so with the colonies, and Mr. Parnell wishes Ireland to be treated as a colony. But there is one great and essential difference between Ireland and our colonies, and it is this—that *the colonies are loyal, and Ireland, I greatly fear, is not.* (Cheers.) I wish I could believe it, but I cannot.

. . . . . .

"I think the Irish vote should no longer be a factor in the British Parliament, and for this reason, that there is no reliance to be placed upon it. The Irish vote is not guided by consideration of what is best for Great Britain and for the Empire. (Cheers.)

. . . . . .

"It seems to me that in considering this question, we have gained something if we have made up our minds that we are no longer to regard the Irish Parliamentary vote—(cheers)—and it seems to me if we come to that conclusion we have gained something more, because we have gained a perception of the only right policy to be

pursued towards Ireland. *I am afraid there is only one policy to be pursued towards Ireland, and it is this—to treat Ireland exactly, so far as may be, as you would treat any other part of the United Kingdom*, whenever you can do it, without regard to the language of menace or insult, or language of opprobrium from those you are trying to benefit. Whenever you can do it, try and treat Ireland exactly as you would treat Scotland or Wales. (Cheers.) If you pass a measure of local government for Great Britain, pass as near as may be exactly the same measure of local government for Ireland. (Cheers.) *She will not thank you; she will receive your measure rather with a curse than with a blessing;* but what I want to point out is, that it is unworthy of British statesmen, who know so much of Irish affairs, to heed any longer the reception which may be given by the leaders of public opinion in Ireland. (Cheers.)"—*Scotsman*, 16th October, 1885.

MR. CANNING.

Mr. Canning exclaimed on one occasion—

"*Repeal the Union! Restore the Heptarchy!*"

This was the only answer Canning vouchsafed when he heard the first whisper of a repeal of the Union and the establishment of a separate Legislature for Ireland. As Peel said, Canning declined argument because he was convinced that repeal of the Union with Ireland was tantamount to the dissolution of the British Empire:—

SIR ROBERT PEEL.

Sir Robert Peel, in the Session of 1834, delivered an important speech on the introduction of O'Connell's Bill for the repeal of the Union. He said:—

"*The security of the Empire depended on the maintenance of that Union*, without which England would be reduced to the condition of a fourth-rate Power in Europe, and Ireland to the desolation of a wilderness. Looking at the relative positions of the islands with the other Powers of Europe, and the Empire rising on the other side of the Atlantic, it was impossible not at once to perceive the impracticability and madness of such a proposition as that before the House. Nature herself proclaimed the folly of such a scheme. To preserve the existence of these islands as a leading Power of Europe it was absolutely necessary that they should be governed and directed by one supreme head and one supreme Legislature A separate Legislature could not alleviate the poverty of Ireland. The establishment of a really independent Legislature in Ireland would lead to incalculable evils in the administration of the affairs of the country. *The one Executive and Parliament of the Empire would be continually coming into collision with the other.* It could not safely be left to Ireland to fix her own proportion of the public burdens of the two countries, and, on the settlement of the commercial system, or on the subject of foreign relations, the very existence of two independent Legislatures would involve both countries in inextricable difficulties. These apprehensions had been more than once realised. One dispute occurred between the Legislative assemblies of the two countries in the year 1785; and this was followed by another on the subject of the Regency, which involved the fundamental principles of all civil government. There had been but two occasions on which the English and Irish Parliaments could quarrel, and on both they did quarrel. . . . *A separate Parliament for Ireland would amount to a disbanding of Society.*"

EARL GREY.

Lord Grey, the great Reform Premier, speaking on this question of Home Rule in the House of Lords in the Session of 1834, said:—

"Connected as were these two great branches of the United Empire (Great Britain and Ireland) by the Legislative Union—*the severance of that Union would*

imply not merely a separation of the Government, but of the people of both countries—the dissevering of that link which could only be destroyed by the agency of the people themselves—the dissolving of all those ties which now connected the two countries. Suppose this is to be effected, what would be the consequence? It would be to expose both kingdoms, thus weakened, to the attacks of foreign enemies."

LORD BROUGHAM AND SIR JAMES GRAHAM.

Lord Brougham spoke in a similar vein, beseeching the deluded people of Ireland not to attempt to sever the bonds which linked two peoples together, but to receive and profit by all the benefits which the perpetuity of those bonds was alone calculated to insure them.

Sir James Graham said, in the course of the exciting Session of 1843, when the repeal agitation was at its height:—

"*A war—much as he deprecated such an awful calamity—would be safer than the repeal of the Union.* If they hesitated to repress the rebellious spirit which was at work in the struggle of repeal, the glory of the country was departed."

THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON.

The Duke of Wellington, himself an Irishman, said:—

"*I shall resist to the last* all measures which aim at making a divided Empire and a divided Legislature."

LORD PALMERSTON AND LORD MACAULAY.

Lord Palmerston, in supporting in 1845 Peel's Bill to increase the grant to Maynooth, said, upon the question of the Union of the Empire:—

"Those who think that a separation between the two countries would be fatal to the British Empire, and that a civil war for the prevention of that separation would be a calamity less great only than the separation itself, must feel, as I do, the greatest anxiety to assist in carrying any proper measure which can tend to undeceive the Irish as to the true feelings of England towards them, and which may have the effect of cementing those ties which I trust may long, for the benefit of mankind, bind the people of the two islands together."

Lord Macaulay's answer to those who proposed the repeal of the Union and a separate Legislature for Ireland was, "Never! never! never!"

EARL RUSSELL.

Earl Russell, writing on the 12th of October, 1872, observed:—

"I fear if an Irish Parliament is set up in Ireland, all her energies will be wasted in political contention. I therefore wish to divert the forces which might give heat and comfort, instead of concentrating them to produce a conflagration. This is the more necessary as the Irish nature is so very inflammable that it prefers a bonfire to the warmth of a moderate fire. I fear, however, that wisdom will be wanting both in England and Ireland."

The present Lord Derby, in a speech delivered at Liverpool on the 9th of January, 1872, expressed his strong opposition to all Ultramontane and Home Rule demands.

DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE IN 1874.

The Duke (then Marquis of Hartington) spoke, in the Session of 1874, during the debate on Mr. Butt's motion in favour of Home Rule, and said:—

"In honour and in honesty, the Imperial Parliament of Great Britain are bound to tell the Irish people that, whatever arguments may be used in reference to this question as it applies to Ireland, while giving every consideration to the just claims of Ireland, we can only look at it from an Imperial point of view; and that we are convinced that, whatever may be the effect of the proposal upon the internal affairs of that country, we can never give our assent to the proposal of the hon. and learned member for Limerick. . . . I can say for myself—and I think I may say the same on behalf of those who sit round me—*that no motive of personal ambition, no consideration of party advantage, can ever induce us to purchase the support of hon. members representing Irish constituencies by any sacrifice which, in our opinion, would endanger the Union between the two countries.*"

MR. DISRAELI.

Lord Beaconsfield, then Mr. Disraeli, in closing the debate on Mr. Butt's motion, showed the utter impracticability of an Irish Parliament. He concluded his speech as follows:—

"I am opposed to this motion because I think there are involved in it the highest and nearest interests of our country. *I am opposed to it for the sake of the Irish people as much as for the sake of the English and the Scotch.* I am opposed to it because I wish to see united, at an important crisis of the world—a crisis that, perhaps, is nearer arriving than some of us suppose—because I wish to see a united people welded in one great nationality, and because I feel that if we sanction this policy, if we do not cleanse the Parliamentary bosom of all this 'perilous stuff," we *shall bring about the disintegration of the kingdom and the destruction of the Empire.*"

Mr. M'Culloch, the able economist, remarks:—

"Unless it were resolved or wished to put an end to all political connection between the two countries, nothing could be more inexpedient and absurd than the existence of a separate independent Legislature for Ireland. Perpetual jealousies could not have failed to arise between it and the Legislature of Great Britain, which must necessarily in the end have led to estrangement, and probably separation. A legislative Union was the only means of obviating these and other sources of mischief; *its repeal would make Ireland a theatre for all sorts of projects and intrigues*, and it would be sure to be followed, at no distant period, by the dismemberment of the Empire."—*Times.*

PROFESSOR GOLDWIN SMITH.

Professor Goldwin Smith, well-known as a strong Radical, wrote from Toronto to the *Daily News*, of January 13th, 1886, emphatically against a separate legislature for Ireland. He said:—

"In this quarter of a century I have learned something more about Irish character, on its political side at least, from what I have seen in the United States; and I know that Irish self-government means the government of Mr. Tweed. You can hardly doubt that an Irish Parliament means separation, the avowed aim of Mr. Parnell, who is not a reformer, but a sworn enemy of great Britain. *You may impose limitations, but they will not be worth the paper they are printed on.*

The agitation for their abolition will commence on the morrow of the capitulation. Nor, depend upon it, will dismemberment stop there. By want of patriotic leadership the spirit of your people is being broken, and they are being prepared to abdicate their greatness. Is it not better to show a little British fortitude and patience before we strike our flag?"

MR. FORSTER.

One of Mr. Forster's latest acts before his most untimely death was to give a clear expression of his opinion upon the question of Home Rule. Writing from the Osborne Hotel, Torquay, he said:—

"To prevent misconstruction, I wish to say that I do not believe that in Home Rule, or in any form of Irish Parliament, we should find a deliverance from the Irish difficulty, and I also think that they would be fraught with danger to Great Britain as well as to Ireland itself."

Mr. LECKY.

Mr. W. E. H. Lecky addressed a letter to the *Times* on the Irish question. The following are extracts:—

"TRAITORS OR FOOLS.

"The essential fact of the Irish question is that the party which demands Home Rule, the party which has won eighty-five seats in the present representation of Ireland, is a party which is animated by two leading ideas—*a desire to plunder the whole landed property of the country, and an inveterate hatred of the English connection in every form.* No one who has read the speeches of the leaders of that party in Ireland can doubt it. The party in America, who are the paymasters and the real directors of the whole movement, have openly, uniformly, and ostentatiously avowed their objects, and if any English politician has still illusions on the subject, he has an easy way of dispelling them. Let him read for only three months *United Ireland*, the most accredited organ of the party. I will venture to say that any English statesman who reads that paper, and *then proposes to hand over the property and the virtual government of Ireland to the men whose ideas it represents, must be either a traitor or a fool.*

"THE CONSTITUTION OF IRISH SOCIETY.

"The fundamental condition of the situation in Ireland is not difficult to understand. A third of the population are thoroughly loyal to the Union and the connection, and that third constitutes what, till a few years ago, would have been generally considered the natural governing body of the country. It comprises almost all the Protestants, the Catholic gentry, the great majority of the Catholics in the professions, an important section of the Catholic middle-class, as well as those numerous Catholics, who in the army and the constabulary have shown themselves on so many trying occasions the most devoted servants of the Crown. Two-thirds of the population, on the other hand, have supported the disloyal side; but among them are the poorest, the most ignorant, and the most dependent in a country where extreme ignorance and poverty are much more common than in England, and this party has been mainly supported by foreign subsidies. Much of this disloyalty is due to genuine political or religious animosity, but much also to intimidation, to hopes of plunder, or to a belief that the disloyal side is the winning one.

"RESTORE THE LIBERTY OF THE PEOPLE.

"What is wanting in Ireland is not an extension of local government, *but a restoration of the liberty of the people, of that first and most fundamental*

condition of liberty, a state of society in which men may pursue their lawful business and fulfil their lawful contracts without danger or molestation. Representative institutions, newspapers, public meetings, and juries are excellent things, *but the liberty of the individual is more precious than any of them, and there is far more of it at the present time in Russia and in Turkey than in Ireland* Unless there is sufficient patriotism in the English parties to combine, and that very speedily, to restore the empire of the law, industrial ruin must speedily follow, and with it a state of anarchy that can only be quelled by the sword." [*This was written in* 1886. *Since then individual liberty has been restored by Mr. Balfour's administration with the most blessed results to Ireland and the Irish people.*]

MR. J. S. MILL.

"It is my conviction that the separation of Ireland from Great Britain would be most undesirable for both, and that the attempt to hold them together by any form of federal union would be unsatisfactory while it lasted, and would end either in reconquest or in complete separation. For generations it is to be feared that the two nations would be either at war or in a chronic state of precarious and armed peace, each constantly watching a probable enemy so near at hand that in an instant they might be at each other's throat. By this state of their relations it is almost superfluous to say that the poorer of the two countries would suffer most. To England it would be an inconvenience; to Ireland a public calamity, not only in the way of direct burthen, but by the paralysing effect of a general feeling of insecurity upon industrial energy and enterprise. Let it not be supposed that I should regard either an absolute or a qualified separation of the two countries otherwise than as a dishonour to one and a serious misfortune to both."

MR. MATTHEW ARNOLD.

In an article entitled "The Nadir of Liberalism," in the *Nineteenth Century* for May, 1886, Mr. Matthew Arnold says of Mr. Gladstone's Irish schemes:—

"The project of giving a separate Parliament to Ireland has every fault which a project of State can have. It takes one's breath away to find an English statesman propounding it. With islands so closely and inextricably connected together by nature as these islands of ours, to go back in the at least formal political connection attained, to make the political tie not closer but much laxer, almost to undo it—what statesmanship! And when, estranged from us in feeling as Celtic Ireland unhappily is, we had yet in Ulster a bit of Great Britain, we had a friend there, you propose to merge Ulster in Celtic Ireland! you propose to efface and expunge your friend! Was there ever such madness heard of?"

LIBERAL STATESMEN ON THE IRISH NATIONALISTS.

MR. GLADSTONE ON HIS ALLY, MR. PARNELL.

This is Mr. Gladstone's opinion upon Mr. Parnell and his followers, expressed at Leeds on October 7th, 1881:—

"For nearly the first time in the history of Christendom, *a body—a small body—of men have arisen who are not ashamed to preach in Ireland the doctrines of public plunder.* . . . . . I take as the representative of the opinions I

denounce the name of a gentleman of considerable ability—Mr. Parnell, the member for Cork—a gentleman, I will admit, of considerable ability, but whose doctrines are not such as really need any considerable ability to recommend them. *If you go forth upon a mission to demoralise a people by teaching them to make the property of their neighbours the objects of their covetous desire it does not require superhuman gifts to find a certain number of followers and adherents for a doctrine such as that.*"

At LEEDS, October 8th, 1881.

"Mr. Parnell is very copious in his references to America. He has said America is the only friend of Ireland; but, in all his references to America, he has never found time to utter one word of disapproval of, or misgiving about, what is known as the assassination literature of that country."

At the Guildhall on the 14th of October, 1881, Mr. Gladstone described his subsequent ally, Mr. Parnell, as

"The man who has unhappily made himself *beyond all others prominent in the attempt to destroy the authority of the law, to substitute what would end in being nothing more or less than anarchical oppression* exercised upon the people of Ireland."

At Knowsley, on the 27th of October, 1881, Mr. Gladstone said of Mr. Parnell and the Land League:—

"It is a great issue; it is a conflict for the very first and elementary principles upon which civil society is constituted. It is idle to talk of either law or order, or liberty or religion, or civilisation, if these gentlemen are to carry through the reckless and chaotic schemes that they have devised. Rapine is the first object; but rapine is not the only object. It is perfectly true that these gentlemen wish to march through rapine to the disintegration and dismemberment of the Empire, and, I am sorry to say, even to the placing of different parts of the Empire in direct hostility one with the other. That is the issue in which we are engaged. Our opponents are not the people of Ireland. We are endeavouring to relieve the people of Ireland from the weight of a tyrannical yoke."

On January 28th, 1881, Mr. Gladstone said:—

"We have got before us a state of crime widely extended. Gentlemen would have us to suppose that this crime is owing to distress in Ireland, that it is owing to evictions in Ireland. It is evident, by the testimony afforded by facts, that it is owing neither to the one nor to the other . . . . *With fatal and painful precision the steps of crime dogged the steps of the Land League.*"

Again, on January 11th, 1882, he said:—

"They (hon. gentlemen) must explain, by some statement of fact, if they could give a different colour to the relations of the Land League to the crimes committed in Ireland, and they must explain the reason of the breaking down of the administration of justice. What did the breaking down mean? *It meant the destruction of the peace of life; it meant the placing in abeyance of the most sacred duties and the most cherished duties; it meant the servitude of good men, the impunity and supremacy of bad men.*"

On April 4th, 1882, Mr. Gladstone uttered these words:—

"In my opinion that item which the honourable gentleman (Sir J. Gorst) has omitted from his speech, is by far the most formidable feature in it, namely, the really strong presumption that behind the commission of these outrages *there are influences at work higher than any that belong to those who commit them.*"

It is to these "higher influences" that Mr. Gladstone has been on his knees on since 1886.

ON THE NATIONAL PRESS OF IRELAND.

"What that literature is is well known. It is well known how it teaches and preaches in every form, with an amount of boldness and audacity varying from week to week and from month to month, *hatred of the institutions and government of the United Kingdom.* It is known how that weekly literature poisons the minds of the people in Ireland, who read it against all law and against the Constitution of their country. It is known how it inflames the passions of the people by rhetorical descriptions of the wrongs of other days. It is known how it makes it impossible for those who read that literature, and read none other, to know the truth with respect to public affairs, and the real conduct and intentions of the Government of the country. It is well known how constantly—sometimes openly and undisguisedly, sometimes under some disguise more or less thin—it points, not to any Constitutional means for the redress of what may be deemed grievances, not to any action within the law and Constitution, *but to violence and civil war.*" *W. E. G., Hansard, vol.* 200, *p.* 100. *17th March* 1870.

THE OBJECTS OF IRISH AGITATORS.

". . . But these are not persons seeking amendment of the law. *They are seeking to dismember the British Empire.* Now, sir, it appears to me that the Executive, in the face of a fact like this, had one duty to perform, not its only duty, but certainly its first duty, and one so distinct and important that nothing should be mixed up with the performance of that duty which can possibly be construed into a condition or a restriction."—*W. E. G., Hans., vol.* 181, *p.* 268, 8—2—66.

MR. GLADSTONE QUOTES MR. PARNELL.

"Comparing his language in and out of Parliament. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Parnell) gave us in this House a most attractive account of the operations and objects of the Land League. Nothing could be smoother than his language, nothing could be more moderate than its purposes, as he described them. But let us see what is the language he holds on the other side of the water. 'Now, what are you to do,' he asks, 'for the tenant who bids for a farm from which his neighbour has been evicted?'"

Amidst constant interruption from Irish M.P.'s, Mr. Gladstone read Mr. Parnell's reply to his own question—a reply sworn to and proved by a special reporter in a Court of Justice.

"You must *show* him on the roadside when you meet him; you must *show* him in the streets of the town; you must *show* him at the fair and market-place, and even in the House of Worship, by leaving him severely alone, by sending him to a moral Coventry, by isolating him the rest of his kind, as if he were the leper of old; you must *show* him your detestation of the crime he has committed, and you may depend upon it if the counties of Ireland carried out this doctrine, that no man, no matter how full of avarice, how lost to shame, will transgress your unwritten code."—*W. E. G., Hans., vol.* 257, *p.* 1,691-93, *January 28th*, 1881.

CONCESSION CREATES NEW DEMANDS.

"It is with concern, and even melancholy, I observe that *the greater the extension we can give to the scope of the Bill the greater become the demands which are made upon us. . . . . There are, however, limits to the embarrassments of proprietorship,* in which it is undesirable that we should involve ourselves, and the extent of the operations we propose to undertake are limited by the Bill."—*W. E. G., Hans. vol.*, 263, *p.* 603, *July 11th*, 1881.

INGRATITUDE OF IRISH MEMBERS.

"This House, I say, has acceded to much to which it was reluctant to accede, and many hon. members from Ireland seem to take no account of that. The hon. member for Longford (Mr. Justin M'Carthy) how does he take account of it. He expressed no acknowledgment, no gratitude to the House—(Mr. Healy: 'Not a bit'). He expressed no acknowledgment, no gratitude to the 550 representatives of England and Scotland for the provisions they have adopted in this Bill, the extraordinary measures they have adopted in this Bill out of consideration for the circumstances of Ireland."—*W. E. G., Hans., vol.* 263, *p.* 658, August 12th, 1881.

CRIME AND THE LAND LEAGUE.

"So that with fatal and painful precision *the steps of crime dogged the steps of the Land League*, and it is not possible to get rid by any ingenuity of facts such as I have stated by vague and general complaints, by imputations against parties, imputations against England, imputations against Governments."—*W. E. G., Hans., vol.* 257, *p.* 1,697, January 28th, 1881.

JUSTICE.

"It is the administration of justice which constitutes the safety of the private individual, and which is the true guarantee both of rights and liberties."—*W. E. G., Hans., vol.* 257, *p.* 1,697, January 28th, 1881.

"LESS THAN CHILDREN" TO GRANT HOME RULE

"Her Majesty's Government would be less than children in the practice of the business of the State and of Parliament, if they could be so weak as to suppose it was possible to bring the policy recommended by them to Parliament into harmony with the objects which the hon. member for Cork is believed to pursue."—*W. E. G., Hans., vol.* 253, *p.* 1,654, 5th July, 1880.

MR. BRIGHT AND MR. CHAMBERLAIN.

This same Nationalist party, Mr. Bright declared at Birmingham, on the 14th of June, 1882, to be

"An Irish rebel party, the main portion of whose funds for agitation came directly from the avowed enemies of England, and whose oath of allegiance is broken by association with its enemies."

Mr. BRIGHT, speaking at BIRMINGHAM, January 3rd, 1882, said:—

"I should like very much to ask any man not inflamed by prejudice or passion—I should like to ask you how it would be possible to treat a portion of the United Kingdom with greater freedom and generosity with regard to representation than Ireland is treated by the Union, and is treated now.

"But surely one may ask, Why is it that in Ireland, where there is a great field for it, this capital does not find great and constant and profitable employment? It is because, in that country, there is disorder and insecurity—(hear, hear)—and every Irishman who, in pursuit of political objects, stirs up disorder and insecurity, is not the friend, but the enemy, of his country. (Loud cheers.)"

AT BANQUET AT THE REFORM CLUB, July 24th, 1885.

"Who were the assailers of the noble earl (Lord Spencer)? They were to be found in some of the representatives of those who professed to be the representatives of Ireland. Now, these men—he spoke of those who had brought those

hideous charges against Lord Spencer—were disloyal to the Crown, and directly hostile to Great Britain. (Cheers.) They obstructed all legislation which was intended to discover, or to prevent, or to punish crime. They had insulted and denounced every man in Ireland concerned with the just administration of the law. They had attacked the Viceroy in a manner hitherto unknown. They had attacked the judges. They had displayed a boundless sympathy for criminals and murderers. (Cheers.) But from their lips not one sentence of emphatic condemnation of the murderers had passed, and not a word of pity for their victims."

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT.

Sir William Harcourt declared at Glasgow, on October 25th, 1881, that the Liberal party would resist Mr. Parnell's policy to the last extremity.

"It is true there is a strong party of irreconcilable politicians who do not represent Ireland, . . . men whose object, I am sorry to say, I believe is not so much to benefit Ireland as to injure England. *Theirs has not been a policy of reconciliation and reform, but of hatred and disunion.* No doubt we are at issue with them to the last extremity, to the extremity which was unhappily reached in the United States of America, where men were satisfied to pour out their blood like water to maintain the integrity of their country and their empire. . . . The land agitation in their hands was an agitation whose object was to destroy the union of the empire and to overthrow the established Government of the United Kingdom. Mr. Parnell admits now that what he wants is not fair rent, he wants no rent at all. He wants to get rid of the landlords, in *order that he may get rid of the English Government;* and for this object every kind of intimidation has been employed to deter honest men from doing their duty and fulfilling their obligations. The Land League has employed terms whose avowed object is to set aside and overrule the law of the land. It is utterly impossible that any Government, responsible for civilised society, can tolerate such a condition of things. *The Land League has thrown over the false colours of Fair Rent; it has hoisted the Red Flag, and the buccaneering craft sails under its true colours. The Liberal party never will have anything to do with attacks upon property, any more than upon the person of our fellow-citizens.* The landowner has just as good a right to a fair rent as you or I have to the coat upon our back. Whenever the Liberal party has allied itself with anti-social ideas, whenever it follows some of these misty philosophers in courses which have destroyed the safety of society, it has come to grief, as it deserved to come to grief."

At Plymouth, in September, 1885, Sir William Harcourt affirmed that the Liberal party repudiated Mr. Parnell's policy:—

"There has been a still more serious question than boycotting raised in Ireland; because, since the declaration of Mr. Parnell, there can be no doubt what is the policy that he and his party have adopted—it is a policy of absolute separation of the two countries. How has that declaration been met? Two speakers, eminently entitled to represent the Liberal party—Lord Hartington and Mr. Chamberlain—have spoken on this matter, and they have spoken in a manner worthy of their position, and worthy of the party they represent."

Both Lord Hartington and Mr. Chamberlain thus spoke strongly against any grant of "Home Rule," and distinctly repudiated in their speeches the Separative Policy of which Sir William Harcourt is now the champion.

Again, at Blandford, in the same month, Sir William Harcourt declared that the Liberal party were pledged to face the Parnellites:—

"I will give you one more specimen. Mr. O'Brien, the editor of *United Ireland*, made a speech in which he said this:—'Mr. Parnell's eighty members of Parliament would fasten in the flank in the English Parliament, and rankle in them like a spear-head. If the English people did not want peace, Mr. Parnell would give them war—such war as eighty Irish guerillas could carry on with the weapon of the franchise, with the weapon of the boycotting pike, as it was called, and with any other weapon that time and opportunity might offer them.' That is what we have to meet, and if the English Parliament is not to become a helpless tool in the hands of this party you must give an overwhelming majority to the only party which has the courage and the honesty to face them."

Sir William Harcourt has argued forcibly to establish the identity of Parnellism and Fenianism:—

"We have heard the doctrine of the Land League expounded by the man (Mr. Dillon) who is an authority to explain it, and to-morrow every subject of the Queen will know that the *doctrine so expounded is the doctrine of treason and assassination . . . . . To-morrow the civilised world will pronounce its judgment on this vile conspiracy . . . . .* The Land League is an association which depends upon the support of the Fenian conspiracy.

. . . Who were the chief agents by whom it was started and conducted? Why, they were notorious Fenians, many of whom had been convicted, while others were perfectly well known to be connected with the Fenian conspiracy.—("Hansard," vol. 229, p. 160 *et seq.*)

"Mr Parnell said that for himself he had the greatest respect for many Fenians who believed in the separation of Ireland from England by physical force. . . . . Am I right or wrong in saying that this Land League organisation is really Fenian, and Fenian in its character? . . . . . Mr. Dillon said that the Land League had three objects in view—first, to paralyse the Government; secondly, to obstruct Parliament; and, thirdly, to supersede the action of the law. But if they had accomplished these objects they would have done all that the Fenian organisation contemplated—they would have overthrown the Constitution as much as if they had attacked it successfully by open force. . . . . Mr. Parnell has never denied that there are a great number of Fenians connected with the Land League in America. He cannot deny it. . . . . When we see men seeking the support of arms to assist their purposes, and find members of the Land League in communication with Communism in Paris and Fenianism in America, then I say the maxim applies, 'Noscitur ex sociis.'"—('Hansard,' vol. 250, p. 842.)

THE VIEWS OF THE IRISH LEADERS.

MR. PARNELL.

At CINCINNATI, February 23rd, 1880.

"*None of us*, whether we are in America or in Ireland, or wherever we may be, *will be satisfied until we have destroyed the last link which keeps Ireland bound to England.*"

At BROOKLYN, January 15th, 1880.

"*Mr. Gladstone*, in one of his Midlothian addresses, *said that it was not until a policeman had been shot at Manchester* by a Fenian, and Clerkenwell Prison had been blown up, that the Irish Church question came within the domains of practical English politics. He admitted in that way that you have to act upon English public opinion in some extraordinary and unusual manner in order to obtain any attention for the Irish question. *We are therefore obliged to make the situation a very hot one indeed.* . . . . It is impossible to suppose that the great cause can be won without shedding a drop of blood."

At NEWARK (New Jersey), January 6th, 1880.

"*I think these people murdered yesterday will help us forward now.*"

At CORK, October 3rd, 1880.

"We are determined to do our very utmost to make Ireland great, glorious, prosperous and free, to take the power of governing Ireland out of the hands of the English Parliament and people, and to transfer it into the hands of our own people. Determined as we are to achieve these ends, we believe that we can only achieve them by making the land of Ireland as free as it was when the waters of the flood left it."

At MAYO, on November 3rd, 1885.

"Speaking for myself, and I believe for the Irish people and for all my colleagues, I have to declare that we will never accept, either expressly or implied, anything but the full and complete right to arrange our own affairs, and make our land a nation, to secure for her, free from outside control, the right to direct her own course amongst the peoples of the world." (Loud and prolonged cheering.) —*United Ireland*, November 7th, 1885.

At GALWAY, October 1st, 1880.

"I would not have taken off my coat and gone to this work if I had not known that we were laying the foundation in the movement for the regeneration of our legislative independence."

At LIVERPOOL, November 30th, 1879.

"Let us see, as in 1782, one hundred thousand swords, both Catholic and Protestant, leaping from their scabbards, and believe me, fellow countrymen, it will not be a question of chicanery or of Acts of Parliament, or of anything that can possibly interfere between the rights of our people to make their own laws on the soil of Ireland. . . . I believe the time will come when those thousands, of whom Mr. Killen spoke, shall awaken from their slumbers and herald the Irish nation in its future path of liberty and greatness."

At CORK, March 22nd, 1880.

Replying to Nationalists' address on his return from America, he said that their refusal to take any part in the elections, he was sure, was determined upon after due consideration, and he added that, "In America, both young and old were determined to uphold the cause they upheld in Ireland—*the right to take her place amongst the nations.*" In another speech on the same occasion, he said:—"The time was not far distant when their countrymen in every part of the civilised world would be all united with them as one man in helping Ireland to spring to her feet and strike off the detestable yoke of Irish landlordism. And when they had shattered this infamous system, the time would not be far distant when Ireland would gain the greater right—the right of self-government—the right of nationhood. . . . If we succeed in emigrating the Irish landlords, the English Government will soon have to follow them."

At DUBLIN, on April 29th, 1880, on his return from America.

"Before I go, I will tell you an incident that happened in America. A gentleman came to the platform and handed me twenty-five dollars, saying, 'Here are five dollars for bread and twenty dollars for lead.'"

At CORK, October 4th, 1880.

"Now we are a party occupying an independent position in the House of Commons, pledged to remain aloof from every English party who will not concede to Ireland the right to home government; pledged in the words of Mr. Fred Lucas, to be a separate element in the Legislature, and, if necessary, 'disorderly, disorganizing, interfering with every business that may be transacted, as far as it is expedient or feasible.' (Cheers.) We can push the policy just as far as we like."

At WATERFORD, December, 6th, 1880.

"We stand to-day in the same position that our ancestors stood. We declare that it is the duty of every Irishman to free his country if he can. We refuse to inflict needless suffering on the masses of our people. We will work by constitutional means *as long as it suits us*. We refuse to plunge this country into the horrors of civil war when she has not a chance; but I ask any man at this board, I ask any true Irishman, be he priest or be he layman, whether he would not consider it the first duty of an Irishman to do what he could to enable his country to take her place amongst the nations of the world. If it could be shown to him that there was a fair prospect of success from the sacrifice, I ask my reverend and lay friends whether they would not consider it their highest duty to give their lives for the country that gave them birth."

At WEXFORD, October 10th, 1881.

"He (Mr. Gladstone) would have you to believe that he is not afraid of you because he has disarmed you, because he has attempted to disorganise you, because he knows that the Irish nation is to-day disarmed as far as physical weapons go; but he does not hold this kind of language with the Boers. What did he do at the commencement of the session! He said something of this kind with regard to the Boers. *He said that he was going to put them down, and as soon as he had discovered that they were able to shoot straighter than his own soldiers, he allowed those few men to put him and his Government down, and, although he has attempted to regain some of his lost position in the Transvaal by subsequent chicanery and diplomatic negotiations*, yet that sturdy and small people in the distant Transvaal have seen through William Ewart Gladstone; and they have told him again, for the second time, that they will not have their liberties filched from them; and I believe that, as a result, we shall see that William Ewart Gladstone will again yield to the people of the Transvaal, and I trust that, as the result of this great movement, we shall see that, just as Gladstone, by the Act of 1881, has eaten all his old words, has departed from all his formerly declared principles, now we shall see that these brave words of this English Prime Minister will be scattered as chaff before the united and advancing determination of the Irish people to regain for themselves their lost land and their lost legislative independence."

AT DROGHEDA, April 15th, 1884.

"I said in New York, in 1879, when I landed there, what I say to you to-night—that you must either pay for the land or fight for it. . . . . Constitutional agitation and organisation can do a great deal to whittle down the price that the landlord asks for his land; but it must be paid for unless you adopt the other alternative, which I say nothing about. . . In my judgment the Irish land question, if it is to be settled by constitutional means, will have to be settled before the National question can be settled by Constitutional means. I do ask the people of Ireland, as rational beings, not to be turned aside from the idea that they have followed, and followed successfully for the years of the Land League agitation—not

to be turned *aside to the pursuit of a Will o' the Wisp* (i.e., *Davitt's Nationalisation of the land scheme, which is an impossibility*, and which may lead to serious disunion and which undoubtedly will postpone the settlement of the land question, and make the heart grow sick regarding the probability of the restorati n of an Irish Parliament."

At CORK, January 21st, 1885.

"We could not ask for less than the restitution of Grattan's Parliament. While we struggled to-day for that which it may seem possible for us to obtain, we may struggle for it with the proud consciousness that we are doing nothing to hinder or prevent better men who may come forward in the future from gaining better things than those for which we are now struggling."

In LONDON, March 17th, 1885.

"I do not pretend to predict in what way the rights for Ireland will be ultimately gained, but a man in my position ought to consider that in anything he does, and in anything that he says, he ought not to hamper the people in their march for their liberties—he ought not to prevent them from obtaining the utmost and the fullest measure of their rights which may hereafter become possible. We can none of us do more than strive for that which may seem attainable to-day; but we ought, at the same time, to recollect that we should not impede or hamper the march of our nation; that though our programme may be limited and small, it should be such a one as shall not prevent hereafter the fullest realisation of the hopes of Ireland."

In DUBLIN, August 25th, 1885.

"I hope it may be possible for us in the new Parliament to have a programme and a platform with only one plank, *and that one the plank of National Independence*. I feel convinced that our great work and our sole work in the new Parliament will be the restoration of our own Parliament. And when we have obtained it, what will be its functions and what will be its powers? We shall require our new Parliament to do for us these things which we have been asking the British Parliament to do for us. . . . We have, therefore, a great work before us, both in the English House of Commons, for a while, and also in the Irish Chamber. I hope it will be a single chamber, and that we shall not have a House of Lords to cumber us."

In DUBLIN MANSION HOUSE, September 1st, 1885.

"We are told upon high authority that it is impossible for Ireland to obtain the right of Self-Government. I believe that if it be sought to make it impossible for our country to obtain the right of administering her own affairs, that we will make all other things impossible for those who so seek. . . . There shall be no legislation for England."

THREAT TO TAX ENGLISH PRODUCTS.

At WICKLOW, October 5th, 1885.

"I have claimed for Ireland a Parliament that shall have power to protect Irish manufactures, if it be the will of the Parliament and of the Irish people that they should be protected. I have claimed that no Parliamentary assembly will work satisfactorily which has not free power over Irish affairs; which has not power to raise a revenue for the purpose of Government in Ireland as shall seem fit and best to that assembly. . . . I claim this for Ireland, that if the Irish Parliament of the future considers that there are certain industries in Ireland which could be benefited by Protection, which could be nursed by Protection, and which could be placed in such a position as to enable them to compete with similar industries in other countries by a course of Protection extending over a few years, the Parliament

ought to have power to carry out that policy. . . . My advice to English statesmen on this question (of guarantees against Separation) is to trust the Irish people altogether or trust them not at all."

ON THE HOLLOWNESS OF MR. GLADSTONE'S LAND ACT OF 1881.

At DUBLIN, September 17th, 1881.

"To COLLINS, President Land League, Boston.

The Convention has just closed, after three days' session. Resolutions were adopted for National self-government, the unconditional liberation of the land for the people, *tenants not to use the rent-fixing clauses of the Land Act*, and follow old Land League lines, and rely upon the old methods to reach justice. The executive of the League is empowered to select test cases, *in order that tenants in surrounding districts may realize, by the result of cases decided, the hollowness of the Act.*"

(Signed) PARNELL.

THE INITIATION OF BOYCOTTING

At ENNIS, September 18th, 1880.

"When a man takes a farm from which another has been evicted, you must show him—you will find what the meaning of the word 'show' is afterwards—on the roadside when you meet him, you must show him in the streets or the town, you must show him at the shop counter—(a voice, 'Shun him')—no, the word was not 'shun,' but 'show'—in the fair, and in the market-place, and even in the house of worship. Leaving him severely alone, by putting him into a moral Coventry, by isolating him from the rest of his kind, as if he were a leper of old; you must show him that that is your detestation of the crime he has committed; and you may depend upon it, that if the population of an entire county in Ireland carry out this doctrine, there will be no man so full of avarice, so lost to shame, as to dare the public opinions of all right-thinking men within the country, and to transgress your unwritten code of laws."

MR. BIGGAR.

At BERMONDSEY, 2nd March, 1879.

"Physical force is the one thing for which the English governing classes care. *They care nothing for justice, they care nothing for reason, they care nothing for the rights of the people, either Irish or English; they are moved only by their fears.* I urge all my countrymen to unite in some organisation—I do not care which—and make as much display of physical force as possible. You may be few in numbers; but, when you remember the great results which flowed from the determined action of the handful of men at Manchester and Clerkenwell, you cannot doubt of their ultimate success."

At CORK, 21st March, 1880.

"*We have seen what Hartmann has done in Russia*, and if the Constitutional course we are pursuing in Parliament at present fails in its object, *I think Ireland may be able to produce another Hartmann, and probably with better results.*"

MR. HEALY'S RECORD.

At LIMERICK Election, 1883.

"The people of this country never will be satisfied, and never ought to be satisfied, so long as a single penny of rent is paid for a sod of land in the whole of Ireland."

At WEXFORD, November 24th, 1880.

"What is that mandate? To give expression on every occasion and in every way to the undying spirit of hostility which animates us all to British domination in Ireland."

At NEWPORT, January, 1884.

"The Government said, and others also said, the Land Act was a full and final settlement of the land question. All I say is, 'Wait till after the next General Election, and they will find out their mistake.'"

At MULLINGAR, 1st June, 1884.

"Never since the passing of the accursed Act of Union have the hopes of the Irish people for independence been more likely than now to be accomplished."

At BOSTON, from the *Irishman*, December 24th, 1881.

"We believe that landlordism is the prop of English rule, and we are working to take that prop away. To drive out British rule from Ireland, we must strike at the foundation, and that foundation is landlordism."

At a meeting of the National League, in Dublin, September 3rd, 1884.

"What was it that first induced Mr. Gladstone to pay attention to the demands of Ireland? Well, as far as he (Mr. Healy) could gather, it was the outrages that were committed in the country; and they were, therefore, to understand in regard to the British Parliament, which was absolutely deaf to argument, that the best way—the best speaking trumpet—to reach its deaf ear, was the mouth of the blunderbuss.

"Until the rattle of slugs was heard upon the roadside, the Prime Minister of England would not even take the trouble to investigate the ordinary facts in connection with the commonest grievance of their native land."—*Irish Times*, September 4th, 1884.

At KILLUCAN, November 4th, 1883.

"But the turn in the tide had set in, and before the wrath of an indignant people, landlordism and British domination was crumbling away. (Cheers.) A party was formed now, led on by a chief who was not afraid to face the foremost champions of the Empire—(great cheering for Mr. Parnell)—and whatever benefits might have been won for Ireland by the assistance of those who had seconded his efforts, *Parnell was the point of the pike*."

SPEECH IN HOUSE OF COMMONS.

"The Government would find face to face with them in Ireland men with no fear in their hearts, who would carry on to the bitter end the glorious struggle for Irish Nationality."

At NEWPORT, CO. MAYO, January, 1884.

"The Government said, and others also said, the Land Act was a full and final settlement of the Land Question. All he would say was, '*wait till after the next general election*,' *and they would find out their mistake*. They were able to enfore their rack-rents by means of the Crimes Act, and was it intended by the Government to make the Crimes Act perpetual in this country? (A voice—'we won't have it.'")

At NEW ORLEANS, January, 1882.

"We wish to get rid of British rule in Ireland. Landlordism is the prop of that rule, and it must be abolished. (Cheers). We are engaged in a great struggle—the reconquest of Ireland."

On the NO RENT MANIFESTO, IN TEXAS. January, 1882.

"The landlord press of America attack this (the No Rent Manifesto) but let them compare it with the tea incident in Boston Harbour. Now it is rank treason. They raised the cry, 'no freedom, no tribute;' we raise the cry, 'no liberty, no rent.' What was the cry of liberty in Boston one hundred years ago becomes the cry of Communism in Ireland to day . . . *Landlordism is the prop of the British Government, and it is that we want to kick away.* The struggle is for Irish liberty, and landlordism stands between us and the glorious sunlight."—*United Ireland, January 28th*, 1882.

At KILKENNY, November 7th, 1885.

"Let the people cast aside all personal dissensions, and let them have one enemy only, and *that enemy the British Government.*" (Cheers)—*United Ireland, November 7th*, 1885.

THE PLAN OF CAMPAIGN ON FUNDING THE RENT AND OUTRAGES AT ERRIGAL TRUAGH, October 4th. 1885.

"He could tell the landlords, however, that if they carried on the evictions there would be outrages. Because, as surely as smoke follows fire, so surely, if they light the torch of destruction, and set it to the houses of the poor, will the poor rely on the arm of justice where the Government fails to protect them. The landlords at the present time said they could not afford to give any further reductions; they said if they made any further reductions they could not live. Well, let them die. If the landlords again had the campaign of evictions, what the Nationalist leaders would have to recommend was this: that the half million of tenant-farmers of Ireland should put up their rents into one common fund, and instead of paying it to the landlords to pay it to trustees. They would then have a sum of six or seven or ten millions of money as a campaign fund—a war chest—to fight the battle with—(Cheers)—and he believed if the landlords saw that the people had even a single million of money to fight with, while they themselves had been delivered of their rents, they should speedily give in and kick the bucket."

Mr. WILLIAM O'BRIEN, M.P.

At LETTERKENNY, 20th Feb., 1885.

"If England's difficulty is Ireland's opportunity, as it is (cheers), England's difficulties are at this moment crowding pretty thick upon her. (Cheers.) (A voice, 'The Mahdi is the boy for her.') Her trade is bad at home, and, as a voice behind me reminds me, her armies are not doing a bit too satisfactory out in the country of that black gentleman, the Mahdi. (A voice, 'Three cheers for the Mahdi.') . . . All sorts of new democratic forces are rising up; and if you, the people of Donegal and the people of Ireland, only do your part here at home, as Mr. Parnell and themen who fight under his banner will try to do in that foreign Parliament in the citadel of the enemy, you will not have to wait long for the opportunity of vindicating the rights of Ireland, and driving famine and landlordism and English rule for ever from the shores of Ireland." (Loud cheers.)—*United Ireland, February 21st*, 1885.

At LETTERKENNY, March 6th, 1885.

"The English may howl until they are black in the face, but if they find that sort of thing (*i.e.* eternal and unquenchable war in the House of Commons with the tyrants of the Irish people) disagreeable for them, they have two remedies, and two remedies alone. They must either suppress the representatives of Ireland altogether, and make up their minds to rule us for evermore with the naked sword—and the sword is sometimes a double-edged weapon—or else they will have to

give us a Parliament of our own—(applause),—in which the will and the wants of the Irish people shall have full and free expression—in which their aspirations shall find satisfaction and contentment, and prosperity and freedom . . . The time has come when the *Irish people may occupy the same position between England and her foes as the Irish party occupy every night between the rival English parties in the House of Commons.*"—*United Ireland, March 7th*, 1885.

At TULLA.

"We would be unworthy of our forefathers, we would deserve the scorn and contempt of those who come after us, if in this day of dawning hope and power for the Irish race we ever faltered or flinched until we have banished the twin demons of landlordism and English rule for ever from our shores, and until we plant upon the highest pinnacle of Dublin Castle the flag of a redeemed and regenerated Irish nation." (Loud Cheers.)—*United Ireland, 30th May*, 1885.

At SHEFFIELD.

"The cause of National Independence for Ireland is immortal and indestructible. It depends upon no man and no party, and if they should fail (but they would not) it would be taken up by other men in other times, who would fight it out, perhaps not as they were doing it in Parliament, but, perhaps, upon the hill-sides of Ireland."—*United Ireland, August 15th*, 1885.

At TULLA, 24th May, 1885.

"I am sorry to observe by one of your resolutions that the land-grabber is a species of reptile that is not yet quite extinct ; but whenever I find a land-grabber still poisoning the air, I generally find it is rather the fault of the people than the law, because I defy all the Crimes Acts that ever were passed to prevent the people from making a land-grabber—a man who steals his neighbour's farm and cuts his neighbour's throat—to make him feel that he is an outcast and the object of scorn, and contempt, and loathing in the sight of his neighbour. They may prevent you from calling it Boycotting, but Boycotting by another name is just as effectual a process."—*Freeman, April 25th*, 1885.

ON THE ABOLITION OF LANDLORDISM.

AT GOREY, August 23rd. 1885.

"When the complete programme of the Land League is accomplished, landlordism would vanish from the country, and the soil of Ireland would be free, its people owning no master but the Almighty, and owning no flag but the *green flag of an independent* Irish nation."—*Irish Times. August 24th*, 1885.

AT KANTURK, CO. CORK.

"England is now entering upon a gigantic struggle with Russia. (Enthusiastic cheers.) It seems to me to be just the moment for the Irish people to proclaim to the world, and to warn England, that in the hour of her peril she will have to deal with an Irish nation, which she has oppressed, impoverished, ruined and plundered (prolonged cheering) a nation which burns and longs for an opportunity of putting an end for ever to English misgovernment in Ireland by peaceable means and by friendly alliance, if that be possible ; but, if not, by any means that God's providence may send to close our long struggle for National independence." (Prolonged cheering.)—*United Ireland. April 18th*, 1885.

At CARRICK-ON-SUIR, September 7th, 1884.

"If we must have hunting at all, let us keep our hands in practice by hunting landlords. (Loud cheers.) Hunt landlordism up hill and down dale until landlords are as scarce as the foxes, that it is now their desire to rear and protect.

(Loud cheers.) Earl Spencer stated at Gowran the other day that there were no more concessions to be given to Ireland. Well, that is in my opinion, a good indication that a change was coming. They said that before, and Fenianism gave them their answer. (Cheers.) They renewed it again, and the Land League movement made them change their tune. (A voice: '*What about* Mr. Gladstone?') *Well, he is one of the best of the cut-throats.* . . . . . Go on, organise, pull together, until the sight of a landlord in Ireland shall be as rare an animal as the wolf."—*Irish Times.*

At DUBLIN, September 3rd, 1886.

They are dealing now, not with this small land, but with the gigantic Ireland across the Atlantic, an Ireland where the British Coercion Acts never ran—(cheers)—and *where a British red-coat never set his foot except to run.* (Laughter and cheers.) I will say no more to you now, because I know you are exhausted. Cries of "No.") Well, any way, I am exhausted if you are not. *I want to say before I retire that these Irish Americans are very extreme men. So are we all, I hope, extreme men.* (Cheers.) *We are all, I hope, as extreme as they in resenting and resisting English rule in Ireland.* (Cheers.) . . . . . This is the message that that great nation of ours across the water bade us bring to you—"*Go on as you have been going. Give a good account of the Churchills*—(hisses)—*and the Beaches*—(hisses)—*and the Castlereaghs*—(prolonged hisses)—*and the Bullers*—(hisses)—*and all the rest of the Bull family*—(laughter)—*who came over here to govern us against our will. Go on as you have been going, and I promise you, for all these millions in America, that they never will spare their treasury, aye, and if the chance offers they never will spare their blood.* (Loud cheers.) *On and on until this great fight is ended in the happiness and the independence of the bright green land that bore us.* (Cheers.)—*Irish Times' report.*

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR, M.P.,

At CHICAGO, December 3rd, 1881.

"The landlord has not got any rent from the ten thousand who are ejected from his farms, and he is not going to get any rent. What becomes of the ten thousand farms meantime? We will put the tenants as near those farms as we possibly can; and *if I were an agent for an insurance society I would not like to have my whole organisation and corporation dependent on the ten thousand farmers* who will go into the farms that the other ten thousand have been evicted from."—*Nation, January 7th*, 1881.

At ST. JOSEPH, MISSOURI, Feb., 1882.

"The Land League binds members not to enter land from which another has been evicted, and I am proud to say out of 600,000 not twelve traitors have been found. *I declare I should like to have an insurance policy on the life of the man who would take possession of an evicted farm.* . . . . We have changed the whole tide of history, and a new epoch has dawned for Ireland. The landlords are all driven out, and the aliens will follow as soon as we can manage."—*United Ireland, February 11th*, 1882.

At MAINE, October 26th, 1881.

"The English Government is based upon murder, rapine, violence, confiscation, sacrilege, buckshot, bayonets, and flying columns. Oh! that these latter were to meet the Irish people in America—then, indeed, would they be flying columns."

ON THE ABOLITION OF RENT.

At ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI, January, 1882.

"We have arisen to the station and dignity of political manhood and strength in Ireland, and we will have it. (Loud cheering, in which the speaker's voice was

drowned.) I want you to understand, that the reduction of rent we require is not a small, or a petty, or a legal reduction, *but the total abolition of rent.* We want the people of Ireland well fed, well housed—to have the full rights of citizens and the full rights of labour. (Loud cheering.) . . . . *Gladstone wants a fixed rent*: the *Land League wants to abolish rent.* Gladstone wants to retain the relations of landlord and tenant. The Land League wants to get rid of the relations of landlord and tenant. (Cheers.) After seven centuries of misrule, after a thousand defeats in battle, after ten thousand scaffolds, after the million of cells, the Irish people are unconquered and unconquerable to the end of time." (Loud cheers.)—*United Ireland, January 28th*, 1882.

At BORRIS, Co. CARLOW.

"Now the Irish people had no arms, but a hundred years ago they had their volunteers, and the volunteers of '82 gave them—not in its plentitude, but in a degree—National independence, and that National independence was what the people had in view, and which they would recover, arms or no arms (cheers). The *resolution of the Irish people to recover their National independence was inflexible and unswerving*, and come what might, the day was not far distant that would see the resurrection of the Irish people, as a free and emancipated nation (applause). . . They should make one more grand effort at the next General Election [A voice—A cheer for '98. Cheers.] Whatever might be in store for them in the future, this he could say, that all they possessed—aye, even life itself—would be worthily spent in striving for their country's independence." (Applause).—*United Ireland, April 11th*, 1885.

AT MARYBOROUGH, October 7th, 1883.

"*The land agitation is only a means to an end, and that end is the re-establishment of the people as an independent nation*, with the destinies of the country in their hands, so that we shall be able to say to England, or to any other power that attempts to dominate the country, '*Hands off: we can manage our own affairs!*'"

AT BORRIS. April, 1885.

"He would tell the man who dealt with any of the aiders and abettors of land-grabbing at Graignemana (great groaning for the land-grabber), he should tell that man that he was an impudent humbug; he should tell that man that he deserved to be boycotted in his own circle. (Cheers). If that man had to confess that, after the eviction of a poor farmer in the neighbourhood of Borris for the non-payment of an impossible rent, he went to the wretched shop-keeping landlord for the farm of the evicted man, or if he had to confess that he supplied money to enable others to do that infamous act, he would say that that man was a scoundrel, and a traitor, and deserved to be treated as such by his neighbours." (Applause).—*Freeman, April 7th, 1885.*

Mr. SEXTON, M.P.,

At the PARNELL BANQUET, December, 1883.

"I will not mince my words, and I say that the one prevailing and unchangeable passion between Ireland and England is the passion of hate.

"Hatred of oppression was a holy thing, and no rule was more deserving of hatred as an oppressive one than England's rule of Ireland. . . . . The people of Ireland had learned that they must fight the Government foot to foot, and that they must pursue a policy of retaliation and give back blow for blow."

MR. LALOR, M.P.,

At ATHY, October 10th, 1880.

"The French people, at the time of their revolution, took a method of getting rid of their landlords which, unfortunately, you are unable to take. No, you are not able at present to take the method that they took. I wish you were."

Mr. JOHN O'CONNOR, M.P.,

At CORK, August 5th, 1886.

"The Irish in America not alone would be prepared to aid them in the fight for freedom with dimes and dollars, but also with rifles and bayonets if necessary."

Mr. JOHN DEASY, M.P.,

In DUBLIN, January 19th, 1886.

"The Irish party were entering upon this Session of Parliament with the utmost confidence, as they knew they had a united, determined, and an organised people behind them. They would not abate one jot of their demands, *nor accept anything from either of the English parties—unless indeed, as a means to an end*—except the rights that belong to them."

Mr. J. HUNTLY McCARTHY, M.P.,

At ATHLONE.

"We will have no contemptible National Council, no small local boards, such as Mr. Chamberlain suggested, to govern us. We will have Gratton's Parliament, and we will have more than Grattan's Parliament. (Cheers.) We will be as free as a State in the great American Union is free—free to make our own laws for our own people in our own way."—*United Ireland, October 3rd*, 1885.

Mr. E. LEAMY, M.P.,

At CLONMEL, October 24th, 1880.

"The three great obstacles to the National independence of Ireland were the Catholic disabilities, 1829; the Protestant ascendancy, until the disestablishment in 1870; and the third and last great obstacle was this foreign system of land tenure. Let them get rid of this obstacle, and then would be the time for willing hands to rear up the stately edifice of Irish independence."

Mr. O'HANLON, M.P.,

At CAVAN.

"I hate British rule, and I hate the British Parliament. The people are now in a position to maintain their rights, and to insist upon their representatives doing their duty, no matter whether it be in the English House of Commons or any other place—whether it be fighting with the tongue, or pen, or anything else—(applause)—they all determined to maintain their right to a native Parliament."—*Irish Times, October 20th*, 1885.

Mr. MAYNE, M.P.,

At FETHARD, Co. TIPPERARY

"Would England fight one of the strongest powers of the world or not? If England elected to fight Russia, she would have to consider long before the struggle was over what she was going to do with Ireland."—*United Ireland, April 18th*, 1885.

M. J. BOYTON,

At CAHIR, September 19th, 1880.

"When they were able first to achieve their social independence, they might form the rank and file of 250,000 Land Leaguers, select an Irish National Guard,

that, with the weapon of freemen slung on their arm—the rifle—might one day fitly take the place of the organization that a hundred years ago gave Ireland a brief glimpse of liberty."

Mr. J. J. O'KELLY, M.P.,

At SHEFFIELD.

"He doubted if the Russian Government was half as much hated and detested in Poland as the English Government is in Ireland. ('Hear, hear.') Instead of being the means of separating the two countries and driving them apart, Home Rule, if wisely granted, and in time—(cheers)—would be the means of binding the Empire together, But if Englishmen were unwise enough to endeavour to continue the rule under which Ireland suffered, the seeds would be sown for the destruction of the Empire. (Cheers.) England would have to face one of two things—to give Ireland Home Rule, or the question of the separation of the two countries." (Cheers.)—*United Ireland, October 3rd*, 1885.

Mr. W. REDMOND, M.P.,

At CHICAGO, January 30th, 1884.

"There is not a supporter of Parnell in Ireland, or in America, or in Australia, who, if a reasonable opportunity should arise for hastening the liberty of Ireland by force, would not fly to it with the energy of hope and frenzy of revenge. No, the Irish race scattered throughout the world has grown up with only one aspiration—National independence. In three worlds it now presents itself in vigorous and distinct life. Three worlds the Irish National League has drawn together like three leaves on a single stem. Behold the League's new shamrock—Ireland, America, Australia! (Cheers.) . . . . It is the symbol of unity in Trinity; it is the symbol of Irish union, Irish determination, Irish youth and strength; it is the symbol of Irish National independence to be achieved for Ireland by the Irish race in its three homes—Ireland, America, Australia." (Cheers.)—*Irishman*, March 1st, 1884.

At MIDDLETON, April 18th, 1884.

"The Land League was founded to destroy landlordism . . . . to banish poverty from Ireland. (Cheers.) The Land League was founded for the purpose of recovering the land of Ireland—this proud soil for which their fathers bled—(cheers)—from the landlords, and giving it to those who owned it before God—the men who tilled the soil. (Cheers.) Unfortunately, so enslaved had been the Irish people, that they were not in a position to right their wrongs by having recourse, like the people of America, to the use of forcible means."—*Freeman's Journal*, April 19th, 1884.

At MEETING OF NATIONAL LEAGUE IN DUBLIN, September 16th, 1884.

"As sure as God made this earth, if Mr. Parnell's methods, and the Parliamentary party's methods, and the methods of that open organisation failed, there would be other methods tried in this country. . . . . The Land Act was only given to them when fierce and strong; the Church was only disestablished because of the Fenian movement. He wondered exceedingly what upheaval of the country would be the prelude to the granting of Home Rule."—*Freeman*, September 17th, 1884.

In HOUSE OF COMMONS, on FRANCHISE BILL.

"I accept the Bill as far as it goes; but you need not think that it will have the effect of staying the agitation of a *separatist* character which exists in Ireland; for if you give us this Bill, or twenty more Bills of the same description, *we will never cease from that agitation until we fully obtain our object.*"

At GOREY, WEXFORD, August 23rd, 1885.

"They did not desire to have anything more to do with kings and queens, for the only style of government to which Irishmen could look for freedom and prosperity was one which would be democratic and republican."—*Irish Times*, August 24th, 1885.

At NURNEY, KILDARE, February 15th, 1885.

"At a number of meetings which had lately heen held throughout the country, cheers had been given for the Mahdi (another cheer for the Mahdi); and he believed that nothing which had occurred for years so much brought home to the English people the bitter fact, and the great truth, that Ireland regarded England as her enemy, and rejoiced at her misfortunes."—*United Ireland*, February 21st, 1885.

Mr. J. E. REDMOND, M.P.,

At OLDHAM.

"They must be satisfied with nothing less than Ireland governed by an Irish Parliament, elected by the Irish people alone, and responsible to them alone."—*United Ireland*, July 4th, 1885.

P. W. NALLY, LAND LEAGUE ORGANISER,

At BOHOLA, July 24th, 1880.

"This resolution that I proposed, that no man take another man's land, that is fifteen months now, and it has not been digested yet. *There wants to be an injection.* Like a doctor, if *one pill* does not do, to administer a dozen to help them to operate. The Peace Preservation Act is abolished altogether. Each of you can have a licence for ten shillings. Well, by paying ten shillings you can shoot the whole year round. The Act is that you can shoot jackdaws, magpies, vermin, *and the nuisance.*—A voice: 'The police.'—Nally: Don't shoot the police—*the landlords and land-grabbers are not brought under it.*—(Laughter.)—I am not telling you to shoot, but I am telling you what you can do if you like. There is only ten shillings licence for the whole year round. You will have to pay three pounds for game, but *the other applies to the vermin line.* It is useless to be proposing unity while we have such scoundrels amongst us. Without unity we *cannot get rid of the land-sharks and land-grabbers.* I say you must organise and establish a branch of the Land League. *There has been more good done since this day week—there has been a landlord shot in Ballinrobe.*—(Cheers.)—You all can have rifles, and any of you who are not able to buy a rifle—(cheers)—or gun, have the pitchfork in your hand. But you must pay ten shillings for the licence if you want *to shoot the vermin—you know the vermin* I mean, what is nibbling at your hearts.—(Laughter.)—You know *pills* are not bad, I mean for to help the digestion."—(Laughter.)

P. J. SHERIDAN, "INVINCIBLE" EMISSARY,

At LACKAGH, August 1st, 1880.

"Mr. Chairman and fellow-countrymen, I feel proud at seeing you assembled here to-day in your thousands. We must assert our rights, and if we do not get them through our members of Parliament, I would ask you then to ring out your voices *through the muzzles of* '*Minie*' rifles as well as from those platforms. We

have America at our back, and she is watching over us and helping us in the hours of our distress. (A voice—'Cheers for America.') There are evictions in all parts of Ireland; the landlords are fighting against us with a strong hand. Organize yourselves then; join the National Land League, and by this means you will see your country what she once was, a free and prosperous country. (Cheers.) God forbid that we will ever forget to make Ireland a nation; and when *I say Ireland a nation, I mean more than a green flag floating from Dublin Castle; I mean Ireland for the Irish.* If the Government of Ireland. . . . Most of us here will agree that the highest form of Government is a Republic. Well, you may establish an Irish Republic on Irish soil; but as long as the tillers of that soil are forced to support class, your Irish Republic would be but a mockery of freedom." (Cheers).

MICHAEL DAVITT,

At CLONMEL, January 5th, 1884.

"Let us to-day, at the beginning of 1884, once more declare in unfaltering tones what it is for which we are struggling. First, we are carrying on the struggle to win the land of Ireland for the people of Ireland; and, secondly, to win for our country the *inestimable privilege and dignity of a nation* . . . . . We mean by the 'land for the people' the Irish soil for the Irish people, to be held by the nation for the people and not for any foreign garrison. What do we mean by self-government for Ireland? Laws made in Ireland by Irishmen for Ireland—laws made to be observed, and not to be despised or condemned."

At CHICAGO CONVENTION, August, 1886.

"Mr. Davitt (in the course of a defence of the Parliamentary action) then continued to say that he never boasted of what he had done or might do for Ireland. *If physical force became necessary he, too, would resort to it.*"—*Chicago Citizen and Irish World reports.*

The Rev. EUGENE SHEEHY, P.P. (present, W. H. O'Sullivan, M.P., and Mr. T. Harrington, M.P.), at KILMALLOCK, County Limerick, April 12th, 1885.

"There was but one land-grabber he liked, and that was the White Czar—this Muscovite gentleman, who had put his head over the Afghan border and declared that he would have that little slice of English territory (cheers for the Russians. A voice—Let the Czar send to Ireland and he will get plenty of volunteers)."—*United Ireland*, April 18th, 1885.

Mr. O'RYAN,

At ANACARTHY, Tipperary, on April 26th, 1885.

"A gentleman standing by him on the platform—a stranger in Tipperary—after looking on the surging masses below, said: 'These do not look like men, who, when they load the rifles, would forget to put in the bullets (immense cheering). There was the character of the Tipperary men in an epigram.' . . . England was in difficulty and in danger (loud cheering)."—*United Ireland*, May 2nd, 1885.

POLITICS AND PRIESTS.

THE EVIDENCE OF THE SOUTH MEATH ELECTION PETITION.

At the last General Election the Irish Nationalists were divided into two parties—Parnellites and anti-Parnellites. Both parties demand "Home Rule," and both belong to the Roman Catholic faith. But the anti-Parnellites had the ardent support of the bishops and priests of the Roman Catholic Church, who canvassed, preached, and worked on their behalf in every Irish constituency. By this clerical support most of the 72 anti-Parnellite Irish Nationalist members gained their seats. The anti-Parnellites are all followers of Mr. Gladstone, and his majority is due to their support. The Parnellites, though they wish for "Home Rule," profess to be independent of English politics.

In two constituencies—North Meath and South Meath—the clerical intimidation was so gross that the defeated candidates petitioned, and in both cases the judges declared the election to be void on account of this clerical intimidation. The members thus unseated were *Mr. Fullam* and *Mr. Michael Davitt* both anti-Parnellites and Gladstonians.

The Unionists contend that one of the effects of Home Rule would be virtually to place the loyal Protestants of Ireland under the rule of the Roman Catholic Priesthood. The Home Rulers reply that this is mere exaggeration and bigotry.

The following extracts from the testimony given on oath at the South Meath Election Petition will help the electors to decide for themselves which party is in the right: --

BISHOP NULTY'S PASTORAL LETTER.

The following are extracts from the pastoral letter which the Roman Catholic Bishop of Meath caused to be read in every parish church throughout the diocese on July 3rd (the election being on July 12th):—

"It is sad and humiliating to see upright, patriotic Irishmen, and chaste, virtuous Irishwomen, striving for the ascendancy of Parnellism, and thus doing their very utmost to demolish the great breakwater which God and nature have raised up to protect Christian society from being submerged by the deluge of adultery and crime with which the unbridled, licentious passions of wicked men and of shameless and abandoned women threatened to overwhelm it. In a state of

The extracts have been verified by reference to the report of the *Irish Daily Independent*, which was described by the judge who tried the case (Mr. Justice O'Brien) as "a most singularly accurate report."

human society in which there were no prisons or jails, in which deliberate and cold-blooded assassins and murderers would not be hanged or executed ; in which thieves, burglars and robbers would not be arrested, imprisoned, or transported ; and in which adultery was regarded as a harmless or pardonable pastime, the gifts of life at its root, and in its source.

"But I must confess that I have stronger, deeper, and much sterner antipathies and dislikes to the anti-Catholic and anti-National character of the living organization or party into which Parnellism has developed. . . . . *Parnellism strikes at the very root and saps the very foundations of Catholic faith.*

"I have already proved, I trust, to your satisfaction, that Parnellism is much more than a political question, and that it is an essentially and an intensely religious question as well. All the successors of the Apostles in this country—that is to say the 29 archbishops and bishops of Ireland— have solemnly warned and taught their respective flocks that Parnellism was unlawful and unholy.

"That it was in distinct, direct, and essential antagonism with the principles of Christian morality, and even dangerous to their faith as Catholics, and consequently that they should shun and avoid it.

"They who refuse to accept that teaching or that principle on the unanimous authority of the whole Irish Hierarchy, deprive themselves of every rational ground or motive for believing in the truth of any of the other doctrines of their religion.

"Because it is solely on the authority which they here despise and decry that they know, or possibly can know, that any one of those doctrines was ever revealed at all by God Almighty.

"If the bishops can mislead or deceive their flocks on this particular doctrine what is to prevent their doing exactly the same in the case of any of the other doctrines which they are continually teaching? Invincible ignorance may undoubtedly excuse many of the misguided but well-intentioned men who still cling to Parnellism. *but no intelligent or well-informed man can continue and remain a Catholic as long as he elects to cling to Parnellism.* . . . .

"Now, the high and Divine dignity of our sacred character and calling necessarily entitles us to the reverence, respect, and veneration of every man who really believes in his religion. *It is through our preaching and teaching alone that the faithful receive the Divine faith and knowledge without which they cannot be saved.* It is exclusively through us that the clean and holy oblation of the Sacrifice of the Mass is offered daily for the living and the dead on the thousands of altars throughout our country. It is through our ministry that the poor penitent gets forgiveness of his sins in the Sacrament of Penance.

"*The dying Parnellite himself will hardly dare to face the justice of his Creator till he has been prepared and anointed by us for the last awful struggle and for the terrible judgment that will immediately follow it.* Should the day then ever come when we shall have lost the confidence and have fallen in the estimation of our people, when, instead of reverence and respect, they shall regard us with distrust, aversion and dislike, when the 'soggarth aroon' will be regarded as the base and corrupt traitor of the interests of his country and the welfare of his people, then our preaching will not be listened to, our sacraments will be neglected and even despised, and the Catholic religion, purpled and hallowed as it is by the blood of our forefathers, will be radically extirpated out of our country. This is the natural tendency and will be the inevitable result of Parnellism. I earnestly entreat you, then, dearly beloved, to stamp out by your votes at the coming election this great moral, social and religious evil which has brought about so much disunion and bad blood amongst a hitherto united people, which has worked so desparately, but in vain, to break the golden link of love that has bound the priests and the people for

centuries inseparably together, which by sowing dissensions in the National Parliamentary Party has weaked its strength and efficiency, and which has seriously imperilled, on the very eve of victory, the claims of our poor country to its legislative independence. I remain, dearly beloved,

"× THOMAS NULTY,
"*Bishop of Meath.*

MULLINGAR, *29th June*, 1892."

INSTRUCTION FROM THE ALTAR.

Mr. Richard McIntosh deposed:—

"I attended mass at Ardcath Sunday week before the voting. Father Carey read the pastoral. The Sunday before the election Father Carey preached a sermon. He said, 'he had the blank form of a voting paper in his hand.' He said, 'the first name was Dalton and the next name was Fullam.' He told the voters to go to the booth, and, '*in the name of God, to put their cross after Fullam's name*, in the interest of religion and for the good of their country.'"

TREAT THEM AS WILD BEASTS.

Patrick Byrne said:—

"My parish church is Cool, and parish priest Rev. Father Fay. On the Sunday before the election Father Fay addressed the people between the Gospels. He said, 'the Parnellites were men opposed to the clergy and religion. That he would treat them as wild beasts in the Zoological Gardens, and put them in cages. They were without religion, and were followers of Garabaldi.' He went on to tell how they should vote for Mr. Fullam. He would show them, after mass, how to place their marks on a blank paper. He said, 'the man who would not vote for him he would not forgive him then or ever.' He was in his vestments at the time."

HE SAID "I WOULD GO TO HELL."

Thomas Darby said:—

"I was at Kill chapel when the pastoral was read by Father McDonnell. The next day the priest called at my house. He came in and he said 'whether is it Darby or Murtagh lives here?' I stood up and said 'I am Darby.' He asked who I was going to vote for, and I said 'Mr. Dalton.' He said '*I would go to hell*,' and I said 'if I would I would have comrades.'"

SETTING FIRE TO HEELS AND TOES.

John F. Monahan was examined, and said:—

"I attended Castlejordan chapel on 29th June [a Saint's day]. Father O'Connell delivered a sermon after the first Gospel. He said that there was to be a Federation meeting in Clonard, that the priest expected everybody to go, and, in fact, he commanded them to go; that their parish priest expected them to go, and that he would be going there himself as well as the parish priest. He said that the Parnellites were *infidels and heretics*, that he would make it hot for them, that he would meet them in their homes, on the highways and bye-ways, and 'in the church,' or 'at the rails,' I could not say which. He also said that anything he took in hand before he was not put down in, and he would not be put down this time. He said, too, *that 'he would set fire to the heels and set fire to the toes.'*"

(*N.B.—This evidence was verified by five other witnesses, and accepted by Mr. Justice O'Brien as substantially correct.*)

NO MASS FOR PARNELLITES.

Peter Fagan was examined.

"I remember going to mass at Clonard on July 10th. There was a crowd of persons at the chapel gate. I attempted to get in. Somebody called out 'here is a Parnellite,' and not to let him in."

Did you go away or stay? I stopped.

Did you go down on your knees? *I went down on my knees outside the gate on the kerbstone.*

Did you say your prayers on your knees on the kerbstone? Yes.

During the whole of mass? Yes.

Did any one of these men who were keeping the gate kneel down? They did for a short time during part of the mass.

(N. B.—Similar testimony was given by three other witnesses.)

A TERROR FOR THE DEATH-BED.

Patrick King, a caretaker, said:—

"On November 18th I was canvassed by Father Tynan for my vote for Mr. Fullam, and I said I would not give it. He told me I had a right to give it, and I said I thought not. He told me it was a matter of religion, and I should vote according to my religion. *He said that if I was dying he would not attend me.* He said he would leave it to my own conscience."

NO CHRISTIAN BURIAL FOR A PARNELLITE.

John Cowley, of Kilcavan, was next sworn. He said:—

"The Rev. Mr. Tynan is my parish priest. The day before the election Father Tynan spoke to me about my vote. He met myself and another man on the road, and he says, 'Boys, I am canvassing.' He said to the other man, 'You have a vote.' He said the same thing to me. I said I thought not, and he said I had. I said I would vote for neither party if I had one. He told me I was bound to vote for my religion on the pain of being expelled from the Church."

Did he add anything to that? He *did, that I would be deprived of Christian burial when I died.* I said I did not know of that; then I walked away. The other man stopped with Father Tynan.

MARKED MEN.

Michael Gaughan said:—

"I was at mass at Rathmoleen on the Sunday the pastoral was read by Father McDonnell. After reading it, he said 'the time had come when no one could remain a Catholic and be a Parnellite, that a few parties went through the parish looking for votes, and that they reminded him of the wandering Jew.' He said 'there was to be a meeting held in Longwood on that day, and he required them all to be there and to bring sticks with them, not for fighting, but to protect themselves.' He said, 'I will be there, too, and if anyone assaults us I will strike the first blow.' He said 'he would cut them down like a weed that would grow up and destroy the fertile soil.'"

VOTING FOR FATHER BRADY.

Patrick Moore was sworn, and said:—

"I heard the Bishop's pastoral read in Dunboyne chapel by Father Brady. I attended mass the following Sunday. Father Brady said that anyone that went against the Bishop he would have done with him. I canvassed extensively in my own district for Mr. Dalton. I asked one man who he was going to vote for, and he said 'Father Brady.'"

ON THE WAY TO THE DEATH-BED.

John Murtagh, a labourer, next took his place in the witness box. He said:—

"I live at Kildalkey, and I voted at Athboy. I know the Rev. Mr. Fagan, curate of our parish. Father Martin is the parish priest. About a week before the election I remember going for Father Fagan to attend one of my family who was sick. I met him in the street at Kildalkey. He asked me did I want him. *I told him I wanted him to attend a sick woman.* He asked me after a few perches of travel if I had a vote. 'Well,' says I, 'I do not know, your reverence, until I look after it.' 'And if you had a vote,' says he, 'who would you give it to?' 'Who would I give it to,' says I, 'but to the man who begged the world for me,' meaning Mr. Parnell. He called Mr. Parnell then a blackguard. He said, my lord, that he should go travel that part of the parish to look for votes, and I told him that he had no business—that they were all Parnellites in that part. I also told him he had no business going to the meeting that was in Trim, that he would get no votes in it—there was a meeting to be held here a few days afterwards—and that the people had their eyes open now, that they were not as they were formerly, and that they saw their enemy and their friend. Then he says—'*That the landlords may come and hunt the whole of ye to hell's blazes out of the country.*' I said, 'You wish your neighbour well, sir.' He told me then he would kick me into the ditch, and I told him, my lord, that I would kick him like a young dog if he would raise a hand to me. Then he said to me, '*You ruffian, you will want me at the Last Day.*' '*I won't hear the woman's confession,*' he said. 'I do not care whether you do or not,' says I. 'I will go for Father Martin.' Then I went in."

Mr. Drummond—Is your wife dead since? She is dead, my lord.

Mr. Justice O'Brien—How long is she dead? Four weeks last Saturday.

Mr. Drummond—Was she on her death-bed at that time? Yes, sir.

THE SACRAMENT REFUSED.

Michael McKenna, of Athboy, the next witness, said:—

"I heard Father Briody refer to the Parnellite party in his sermon on 10th July. He said that the people were bound to follow their priests, and that the clergy and bishops were always safe guides in politics, or some words to that effect. He quoted the text in support of what he said—'He that heareth you heareth me.'

"The Rev. Mr. Fox, parish priest of Athboy, spoke to me about voting."

Did he make any reference to the sacraments? Yes, on the 28th June at the confessional.

Mr. Drummond—Did he say anything about the sacrament? *He told me that he would not give me absolution then, sir.* He knew the part I was taking.

Mr. Justice O'Brien—And was it after that he said to return to him in ten days? After that. Then I told him that I was fully convinced that I was right, just the

same as if I was before God. These are the very exact words that I used. Then he told me that he could not admit me to the sacrament. So then I left.

CANVASSING IN THE CONFESSIONAL.

Michael Lowry deposed that he was a voter:—

"*I was at confession with Rev. Father Behan the last Saturday in June.* After I confessed he asked me was my name Michael Lowry, and I said yes. He asked me would I vote for my priest. I told him I thought I had no vote. He said I had. He said not to let on to anyone that he spoke to me."

Patrick Kelligan, a bread car driver, was next sworn, he said:—

"On the Saturday before the poll I was at confession with Father Behan; before I left the confessional he spoke on the subject of 'Parnellism,' and said that 'the Parnellites were good some time ago, and it was not right to follow them now.'"

William Shelley, a voter, deposed:—

"In the month of June I was at confession with Father Behan; before I left the confessional he asked me had I vote, I told him I did not know whether I had or not. He told me I would have a vote, and that I should have a vote, and then he told me to vote for Fullam and that I might shout for Dalton when I went out in the street."

James Cowley, of Daveystown, sworn, and said:—

"I was at confession with Father Behan at Boardmills a week before the election. Before I left the confessional he asked me for my vote. I said I would not give it to him.

EXTRACTS FROM THE JUDGMENT OF MR. JUSTICE O'BRIEN.*

"From the first moment, the clergy threw themselves into the contest with all the overwhelming power, organisation and discipline of their order, and the zeal of men who could be reckoned upon to have no fear from popular insult or violence, and to look to no reward. The Church became converted, for the time being, into a vast political agency, a great moral machine, moving with resistless influence, united action, and a single will. *Every priest who was examined was a canvasser; the canvas was everywhere—at the altar, in the vestry, on the roads, in the houses. There was no place left for evasion, excuse, affected ignorance, weakness, or treachery.* Of the ten polling places there was but one, that at Dunshaughlin, in which there was not a priest as agent and personation agent, with or without laymen. The presence of the priests, no doubt, would be a strong moral influence and check upon cowards and traitors, but it was an influence undoubtedly attended with distinct dangers to the freedom of voters. Of the whole constituency there were not less than, I believe, nine hundred illiterate voters who had to declare themselves in the presence of a priest, to whom so many of them were apparently opposed. The publicity, of course, was the same where there were laymen in the booth, but the real influence would not be the fear of publicity, but of disfavour. The voter would trust the laymen less, but would

FEAR THE PRIEST MORE

—the former he might not see again, but the priest he would constantly meet. I do not say that an adverse vote would be remembered for him, but it is a thing he certainly would fear."

* Mr. Justice O'Brien is a Roman Catholic.

Mr. JUSTICE O'BRIEN, in conclusion, referring to the clergy of South Meath generally, said :—"Under, I have no doubt, a strong obligation of obedience to their own bishop, and whether or not in conformity with their own opinions and sentiments, they did use language calculated to convey to the minds of the voters in this division that their conduct in this election involved

THE QUESTION OF ETERNAL CONDEMNATION

or the contrary. Now, having expressed that opinion, it remains to me to say one word concerning the legal aspects of the evidence concerning this question in relation to agency, and upon that apparently very little difficulty seems to me to arise. I consider if ever there was a case of agency established it was in this particular case. Mr. Fullam was named as the candidate from the very beginning of the contest, he attended all the meetings held, he attended there with clergymen, he named them as his agents, as his personation agents in many instances, he received the subsidy or money provided for the expenses of the election from them or some clergymen, he, upon the public occasion when the victory was celebrated, thanked publicly the clergy for the services they had rendered, and the only question that would remain on my mind as the result of the evidence is the application of this term agent at all, and of the possible application of any such term to the position the clergy assumed. They appear to me to have fulfilled positions of principals, while Mr. Fullam was only the agent, and upon that part of the matter, therefore, I have formed my opinion. With the consequences I have no concern whatever. My concern is with justice ; my allegiance is to justice alone, and in the fulfilment of that obligation I am constrained in justice to declare that, in my opinion, the election for the South Division of Meath, both under the statute and the common law, is void through undue influence, and must be set aside."

Mr. Justice Andrews, in a brief judgment, concurred.

Mr. Fullam, the clerical and anti-Parnellite member, was consequently declared unseated.

NORTH MEATH ELECTION.

EXTRAORDINARY REVELATIONS.

The hearing against the return of Mr. Michael Davitt for North Meath was heard before Mr. Justice Andrews and Mr. Justice Johnson.

James M'Donagh, the first witness, stated :—

"That on the 7th of July he saw a number of cars driving through the village of Charlestown. Father Patrick Fagan was one of them. A man named Lawless said, 'That is none of rotten Mahony's crowd.' Witness went out and booed him. Father Fagan then drove over to his door. Witness' wife and sister came out to pull him in, and as he was going in Father Fagan made a blow at him with his whip."

"Maurice Conway heard Father Hughes preach and state that he wanted every man in his parish to vote for Mr. Davitt."

"WRETCHED FACTIONISTS."

Annie Kirch deposed :—

"That Father Kelly said from the altar that the 'wretched factionists' would be swept into the sea at the General Election. He said he would not like to have the conscience of the Catholic who would vote for the Parnellite candidate. On the days of meetings the people attended mass with sticks. At night people used to come outside her house because she was a Parnellite, and call her the vilest names. (To Mr. Healy.) Mass was refused to be said in her house last year

because she and her brothers were Parnellites. They were tired of asking Father Kelly to say mass. They always enjoyed the favour before. It showed the intimidation to which Parnellites were subjected, for the other farmers' houses had mass said in them."

Patrick Kirch, the brother of the last witness, deposed:—

"That he was an active supporter of Mr. Parnell. After he attended a meeting at which Mr. Parnell spoke, Father Kelly ceased to be friendly. For the past twenty-five years mass was said three or four times each year in the house. That stopped after he attended Mr. Parnell's meeting. In a polling booth at Slane, when an illiterate entered to vote, he immediately threw himself on his knees as if he were going to confession, and in a faltering voice said to the priest, 'Father, I will vote for Mr. Davitt.'"

Margaret Mary Kirch deposed:—

"That Father Kelly said from the altar that there was a gang of hired assassins in Navan, and that the people should go to the meeting armed to defend themselves. He called the Parnellites 'anti-Catholics.' Vile names were called out to herself and her sister."

COWARDLY AND BRUTAL CONDUCT.

Margaret Horan, an aged woman, said:—

"That on the 10th July she went out on the roadside to see a procession of cars enter Oristown. She was asked to cheer for Davitt, but she said, 'Why should I cheer for Davitt; to hell with him.' (Laughter). A man on a car made a motion of the hand as if to strike her. She then picked up a bit of clay and threw it. A priest came up and said 'Kneel down and beg my pardon.' Witness answered 'I shall not, I'm very weak.' The priest then put his hand on her shoulder, and she sank down. The priest struck her twice on the face with his hand. (Sensation.) Her daughter came out of her house and had an altercation with the priest as to whether witness had thrown stones. Her daughter denied she had done so. The priest then gave her daughter a couple of slaps on the face. She did not know who the priest was."

Ann Callaghan, daughter of the last witness, gave evidence:—

"The priest drew his hand out, and said to my mother '*You old devil, you'll be in hell yet.*' 'Religion is going to hell,' says I, 'and if she goes to hell she won't go alone; there will be plenty there.' The priest struck me twice. I was within a few weeks of my confinement."

BISHOP NULTY'S PASTORAL.

"James Daly deposed to having heard Father O'Mullen read the Pastoral of Bishop Nulty from the altar of his parish chapel, at Kilmainham Wood, on July 3rd. On the second day before the poll (July 12) Father Brady asked him if he was a Davittite or a Mahonyite? Witness replied that he believed in the policy of Independent Opposition, upon which Father Brady got down from a car, seized him by the throat, and dragged him about the road. He begged the priest for God's sake not to strike him, for he was a good Catholic, and had never insulted a priest. Father Brady then said he was one of the scoundrels, and that he was striving to prevent a meeting in support of Mr. Davitt. The priest gave him a final shake and then let him go."

James Gannon, of Syddam, deposed:—

"That in June he heard Father Duffy read the Bishop's Pastoral. He advised none of his people to go to a Parnellite meeting, or be seen in such a motley crew, as their object was to put down the Church and religion. At the Navan Meeting Father Duffy came down from the parochial house. He carried a stick

in his hand, and was acting in a defiant manner towards the people. He requested people to go to their homes. They refused to disperse. The priest came up to him, '*left the point of the stick in his chest*,' and said he was the greatest opponent in the parish. The priest then went on and struck a man upon the head with his stick, and caused blood to flow. Father Duffy afterwards struck a second man on the head with the weapon, and the crowd then engaged in a struggle to get possession of the stick."

FATHER CLARKE KNOCKED HIM DOWN.

Mr. John O'Brien was next sworn, and examined by Mr. O'Shaughnessy :—

Were you at Nobber on the day of the polling? Some of the time I was there.

Are you a reporter of the *Independent?* Yes.

Tell me, did you see an incident take place there when a man named Reilly was knocked down? I saw the greater portion of the incident.

Just tell us what the portion of it was that you saw? A row occurred opposite the polling booth, and there was a conversation or rather a wild declamation on the part of a clergyman——

Who is he? Father Clarke—and also a wild declamation on the part of several persons who were present, in consequence of Father Clarke, as was stated, striking a man. I saw a man lying on the grass. One of the men who were present said that Father Clarke had no right to strike any person. Then Father Clarke was told he should not raise his hand, and another asked, "Didn't you knock him down?" Father Clarke replied that he had done so because the man had insulted him.

Did you hear him say, "I didn't mean to kill the man?" Yes, I remember those words.

You saw the man there? I saw the man on the ground.

Was he an old man? He was an old man.

Do you remember Mr. Mahony coming out of the booth? Yes, I fetched him up.

What did Mr. Mahony say to the clergyman? They had come near each other, and Mr. Mahony said, "You know right well that it was a cowardly thing for you to strike the man."

What did he say to that? The clergyman replied, "I will strike you, too, if you don't withdraw the words."

Did he do anything then? He raised his hand and pressed forward a little. There were cries raised by the people, "Oh, you won't," and a movement of the crowd put a great distance between Mr. Mahony and the clergyman.

Did Mr. Mahony say anything else? He repeated his previous observation, "It is a cowardly thing for a clergyman."

Mr. O'Shaughnessy: Now tell us what he told you? I questioned him, and he told me that he was shouting for Mahony, and that the clergyman came up at the head of a mob. Reilly said to the clergyman that "he was vilifying our member." Then the clergyman told him that he had insulted him. Then Reilly said he was going to say the truth according to his conscience, that he had every right to support the cause of the kingdom as well as another, and the clergyman then told him to shut up. And Reilly then said that the clergyman struck him after saying "shut up," and knocked him down, that the blow was on the butt of the ear, and that he was senseless for awhile.

A POOR OLD WOMAN MALTREATED.

Mary Caffrey, an aged woman, was sworn and examined by Mr. Kelloe:—

Now, Mrs. Caffrey. Where do you live? I live in Navan, in a place called Butter Street.

Do you remember the 10th July? Indeed, I do, sir, right enough. I have reason. (Laughter.)

Do you remember a crowd of Mr. Davitt's supporters coming in on that day? Yes, sir.

What happened? They were the most unruly crowd I ever knew. They pulled down a flag belonging to Mr. Pierce Mahony.

Was that in the street? Yes, in the street.

Did you try to get the flag? Yes, I did.

What happened? Instantly I went down, thinking they would not meddle with me, but they riz me up, leaped on me, and put my hip out of joint.

How long were you laid up? Five weeks, your Honour, and I will be laid up the end of my life, I am afraid.

Did they kick and strike you? They just riz me up and leaped on top of me; I asked to be taken in.

Was there any priest there at the time? There was, sir.

Did he say anything? *He said*, '*Let her lie there, the old b*——'.

Now, when the priest made use of that expression, what happened? I strove to get away, and some one brought me to my door.

ABUSE OF THE CONFESSIONAL.

When is the Retreat of the Sacred Heart held; was it held before the election? It was.

One of the clergymen, I believe, was the Rev. Father Jones? Yes.

Did you go to confession to him? Yes.

Mr. Justice Andrews: Where was this? In Kells.

Was it before the election you went to confession?

Mr. O'Shaughnessy: After the confession was over—I am not asking you for anything that occurred during confession—

Mr. Justice Andrews: Can you tell me the time approximately before the election—was it shortly before it or long before it? I think, after refreshing my recollection, it was over a fortnight.

Mr. O'Shaughnessy: After confession was over did this rev. gentleman speak to you about your vote? He did.

Did he speak about voting for Mr. Davitt? He did.

Mr. Justice Andrews: What is his Christian name?

Mr. O'Shaughnessy: He is an auxiliary priest, brought down for the retreat. (To witness): You decline to accede to that? Yes.

Tell me about this confessional. I suppose you went into the confession box? Yes.

You were on your knees? Yes.

Was it when you were on your knees this conversation took place? Yes.

You were in the box? Yes.

On your knees? Partly on my knees. I was going out, but I knelt down again.

To whom did you give the information? Mr. Friery.

When? Some time ago.

How long ago? A good while ago.

A month? More.

THE PRIEST TOLD HIM HE WOULD BE IN HELL.

Patrick Douglas was examined by Mr. Drummond:—

Are you a voter in the polling district of Navan? I am, sir.

What age are you? I suppose I am nearly 70 or over it—70 or 75.

Do you remember a few days before the polling day coming in here to the town of Trim? I do.

Did you come to a lodging-house kept by a lady in Trim? Yes.

What's her name! Mrs. Reilly.

After you were there did Father Behan come in? Yes.

You knew him before? Yes, and he knew me.

He is parish priest of this parish? Yes.

What took place between you and him? He says, "I know you" "Of course," said I, "you know me; sure you were a long time in Navan." He said, "Who are you going to give your vote to?" "Well, I'm going to give my vote, sir," said I, 'to Pierce Mahony." Then he said, "Are you going to go against your good Bishop and your priests, and give your vote to Pierce Mahony?" I said that the Bishop was good to him, but he was no use to me. (Laughter.)

Well? And that I was under no compliment to him. He said, "Didn't he confirm your children." I said it was necessary that that should be done. Then he called me an old reprobate—(laughter)—and he called me an old devil. (Laughter.)

Did you make any answer to these observations? Not a word, sir. *He told me I would be in hell.*

Was there anything further? I said, "God forbid," and he said "Out of this house with you," and he boxed me in the face.

Did he put you out? He threw me into the street.

Did he drag you? He dragged me and boxed me every place he could, and left me a black eye.

THE JUDGMENT.

"Mr. Justice Andrews and Mr. Justice Johnson, at Trim, gave judgment on the 23rd ult. in the petition preferred by Mr. Pierce Mahony against the election of Mr. Michael Davitt as Member of Parliament for North Meath. Mr. Davitt and his counsel were absent, but Mr. Mahony occupied a seat at the solicitors' table, accompanied by Mr. W. Redmond, M.P.

"Mr. Justice Andrews, in first giving judgment, recited the various allegations in the petition—undue spiritual influence, bribery, treating, and illegal hiring—and said that before the trial commenced the leading Counsel for the respondent stated to the Court that, having regard to a recent judgment in the South Meath case, and to the fact, which he admitted, that the Pastoral letter of the Bishop of Meath was read from the altar in all churches and chapels throughout the diocese—including the Northern Division of Meath—the respondent's advisers did not consider that they would be justified in defending the prayer of the petitioner, so far as it sought to void the seat on the ground that such general influence prevailed through the Northern Division of the County during election as to render the election void at common law. He now proceeded to deal with what had been proved during the trial of this case. And first, in respect to a charge of undue influence. The undue influence which was relied upon by petitioner's counsel was that species of undue influence which consisted of

SPIRITUAL INTIMIDATION.

The evidence here disclosed a considerable number of cases in which clergymen had involved themselves, as he thought, most unfortunately, in the strife and struggle of an election—had allowed loss of temper to betray them into deplorable acts of personal violence, which, in some instances, were sworn to have been committed even against women, and some of which no provocation could justify. As regarded

THE BISHOP'S PASTORAL LETTER.

which has undergone so much discussion, he had on a previous occasion been obliged to express his opinion, which was not formed without consideration, and which he had been unable to change. It was his duty to declare that their action with reference to the Pastoral, pending an election, was distinctly illegal, and none the less so because history offered instances, some of them very remarkable instances, of spiritual intimidation at Irish elections, at least, as far back as the Clare election of 1829. He did not entertain the slightest doubt that, wholly irrespective of anything like corrupt motives, the Pastoral, promulgated as it was by the Bishop's instruction, throughout the entire Roman Catholic constituency of North Meath, in which it was publicly read at the altar in all the chapels and at all the Masses on the 3rd July, *amounted to undue spiritual influence of the most potent kind;* and, as *the express purpose of the Pastoral was to induce the electorate to vote at the coming election in opposition to one candidate and in favour of the other, the election was voided at common law,* by reason of the widespread generality of its influence, *and under statute law* by reason of its amounting to undue influence within the meaning of the Act of 1883. With regard to the promulgation of the Pastoral having been by the agents of the respondent, the evidence irresistibly established the fact that, during the election, the respondent was aware of, and adopted and availed himself, without objection, of the action of the Bishop and clergy, and thus

HE MADE THEM HIS AGENTS,

and involved himself in responsibilities for their action in that regard. Some of the clergy commented upon it and enforced it; others read it without comment. In both cases it received their sanction and obtained publicity as an authorised Pastoral from the Bishop. Sermons had been delivered during the election by the Bishop and a number of the clergy, and these he could not leave unnoticed, though he desired to refrain from any unnecessary reference to them. Some of them were upon the lines of the Pastoral, and others were irrespective of it. There were portions of some of these sermons which appeared to him, if he might be permitted to say so, to be

LITTLE IN HARMONY WITH THE SACRED OFFICE

of the preachers, and the temples of religion in which they were preached. The preachers sadly misused their powerful influence. To what further extent could undue spiritual influence go than for a bishop to declare, from the altar, that Parnellism, which was the political faith of one of the two contending parties, was no better than heresy, and that he would approach the death-bed of a profligate or a drunkard with greater confidence in his salvation than that of a Parnellite; or for a priest to say from the altar that to believe in Parnellism was to commit a mortal sin, and so to defy the Church."

"Mr. Justice Johnson said he entirely concurred in the judgment of Mr. Justice Andrews. The Bishop's Pastoral laid down that Parnellism, or the profession of certain political principles, struck at the very root and sapped the foundation of the Catholic faith. The election must, under the Act of 1883, as well as under the common law, be set aside."

Mr. Michael Davitt, the clerical and anti-Parnellite member, was consequently declared unseated.

Electors! This is an accurate account of evidence given on oath, sifted out and judged in a court of law. In the face of it, can English vote for putting the Irish Protestants under the heel of the Irish Priests?

MR. GLADSTONE'S "HOME RULE" BILLS COMPARED.

N.B.—The Bill of 1893 is printed in the left hand column, exactly as in the Parliamentary paper.

The whole of the Bill of 1886 is also given, but the order of the Clauses has been re-arranged so as to be opposite (as far as possible) the corresponding subjects in the Bill of 1893.

1893.	1886.
LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY.	
ESTABLISHMENT OF IRISH LEGISLATURE.	ESTABLISHMENT OF IRISH LEGISLATURE.
(1) On and after the appointed day there shall be in Ireland a Legislature consisting of Her Majesty the Queen and of two Houses, the Legislative Council and the Legislative Assembly.	(1) On and after the appointed day there shall be established in Ireland a Legislature consisting of Her Majesty the Queen and an Irish Legislative body.
POWERS OF IRISH LEGISLATURE.	POWERS OF IRISH LEGISLATURE.
(2) With the exceptions and subject to the restrictions in this Act mentioned, there shall be granted to the Irish Legislature power to make laws for the peace, order, and good Government of Ireland in respect of matters exclusively relating to Ireland or some part thereof.	(2) With the exceptions and subject to the restrictions in this Act mentioned, it shall be lawful for Her Majesty the Queen, by and with the advice of the Irish Legislative Body, to make laws for the peace, order, and good Government of Ireland, and by any such law to alter and repeal any law in Ireland.
EXCEPTIONS FROM POWERS OF IRISH LEGISLATURE.	
(3) The Irish Legislature shall not have power to make laws in respect of the following matters or any of them :—	(3) The Legislature of Ireland shall not make laws relating to the following matters or any of them :—
(1) The Crown, or the succession to	(1) The status or dignity of the Crown

1893.	1886.
the Crown, or a Regency; or the Lord Lieutenant as representative of the Crown; or	or the succession to the Crown, or a Regency;
(2) The making of peace or war, or matters arising from a state of war; or	(2) The making of peace or war;
(3) Naval or military forces, or the defence of the realm; or	(3) The army, navy, militia, volunteers, or other military or naval forces, or the defence of the realm;
(4) Treaties and other relations with foreign States, or the relations between different parts of Her Majesty's dominions or offences connected with such treaties or relations; or	(4) Treaties and other relations with foreign states, or the relations between the various parts of Her Majesty's dominions;
(5) Dignities or titles of honour; or	(5) Dignities or titles of honour;
(6) Treason, treason-felony, alienage, or naturalisation; or	(6) Prize or booty of war.
(7) Trade with any place out of Ireland; or quarantine or navigation (except as respects inland waters and local health or harbour regulations); or	(7) Offences against the law of nations, or offences committed in violation of any treaty made, or hereafter to be made between Her Majesty and any Foreign State; or offences committed on the high seas;
(8) Beacons, lighthouses, or sea marks (except so far as they can consistently with any general Act of Parliament be constructed or maintained by a local harbour authority); or	(8) Treason, alienage, or naturalisation;
(9) Coinage; legal tender; or the standard of weights and measures; or	(9) Trade, navigation, or quarantine.
(10) Trade marks, merchandise marks, copyright, or patent rights.	(10) The postal and telegraph service, except as hereafter in this Act mentioned, with respect to the transmission of letters and telegrams in Ireland.
Any law made in contravention of this section shall be void.	(11) Beacons, lighthouses, or sea marks.
	(12) The coinage; the value of foreign money; legal tender; or weights and measures; or
	(13) Copyright, patent rights, or other exclusive rights to the use or profits of any works or inventions.
	Any law made in contravention of this section shall be void.

RESTRICTIONS ON POWERS OF IRISH LEGISLATURE.

4.—The powers of the Irish Legislature shall not extend to the making of any law—	**4.**—The Irish Legislature shall not make any law—
(1) Respecting the establishment or endowment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or	(1) Respecting the establishment or endowment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or
(2) Imposing any disability, or conferring any privilege, on account of religious belief; or	(2) Imposing any disability, or conferring any privilege, on account of religious belief; or

1893.	1886.
(3) Abrogating or prejudicially affecting the right to establish or maintain any place of denominational education or any denominational institution or charity ; or	(3) Abrogating or derogating from the right to establish or maintain any place of denominational education or any denominational institution or charity ; or
(4) Prejudicially affecting the right of any child to attend a school receiving public money, without attending the religious instruction at that school ; or	(4) Prejudicially affecting the right of any child to attend a school receiving public money without attending the religious instruction at that school ; or
(5) (New) *Whereby any person may be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, or may be denied the equal protection of the laws, or whereby private property may be taken without just compensation ;* or	(5) Impairing, without either the leave of Her Majesty in Council first obtained on an address presented by the Legislative Body of Ireland, or the consent of the corporation interested, the rights, property, or privileges of any existing corporation incorporated by Royal charter or local and general Act of Parliament ; or
(6) Whereby any existing corporation incorporated by Royal charter or by any local or general Act of Parliament (not being a corporation raising for public purposes taxes, rates, cess, dues, or tolls, or administering funds so raised) may, unless it consents, or the leave of Her Majesty is first obtained on address from the two Houses of the Irish Legislature, be deprived of its rights, privileges, or property without due process of law ; or	(6) Imposing or relating to duties of customs and duties of excise, as defined by this Act, or either of such duties, or affecting any Act relating to such duties or either of them ; or
(7) (New) *Whereby any inhabitant of the United Kingdom may be deprived of equal rights as respects public sea fisheries.*	(7) Affecting this Act except in so far as it is declared to be alterable by the Irish Legislature.
Any law made in contravention of this section shall be void.	

PREROGATIVES OF HER MAJESTY AS TO IRISH LEGISLATIVE BODY.

5.—Her Majesty the Queen shall have the same prerogatives with respect to summoning, proroguing, and dissolving the Irish Legislative Body as Her Majesty has with respect to summoning, proroguing, and dissolving the Imperial Parliament. Vide 1st Schedule 1893.

DURATION OF THE IRISH LEGISLATIVE BODY.

6.—The Irish Legislative Body whenever summoned may have continuance for five years and no longer, to be reckoned from the day on which any such Legislative Body is appointed to meet. Vide 1st Schedule 1893.

EXECUTIVE AUTHORITY.

1893.

EXECUTIVE POWER IN IRELAND.

5.—(1) The Executive power in Ireland shall continue vested in Her Majesty the Queen, and the Lord Lieutenant, on behalf of Her Majesty, shall exercise any prerogatives or other executive power of the Queen, the exercise of which may be delegated to him by Her Majesty, and shall, in Her Majesty's name, summon, prorogue, and dissolve the Irish Legislature.

(2) There shall be an Executive Committee of the Privy Council of Ireland to aid and advise in the government of Ireland, being of such numbers, and comprising persons holding such offices as Her Majesty may think fit, or as may be directed by Irish Act.

(3) The Lord Lieutenant shall, on the advice of the said Executive Committee, give or withhold the assent of Her Majesty to Bills passed by the two Houses of the Irish Legislature, subject nevertheless to any instructions given by Her Majesty in respect of any such Bill.

1886.

CONSTITUTION OF THE EXECUTIVE AUTHORITY.

7.—(1) The Executive Government of Ireland shall continue vested in Her Majesty, and shall be carried on by the Lord Lieutenant on behalf of Her Majesty with the aid of such officers and such council as to Her Majesty may from time to time seem fit.

(2) Subject to any instructions which may from time to time be given by Her Majesty, the Lord Lieutenant shall give or withhold the assent of Her Majesty to Bills passed by the Irish Legislative Body, and shall exercise the prerogatives of Her Majesty in respect of the summoning, proroguing, and dissolving of the Irish Legislative Body, and any prerogatives the exercise of which may be delegated to him by Her Majesty.

USE OF CROWN LANDS BY IRISH GOVERNMENT.

8. Her Majesty may, by Order in Council, from time to time place under the control of the Irish Government, any such lands and buildings in Ireland as may be vested in or held in trust for Her Majesty.

Vide Clause 25, 1893.

CONSTITUTION OF LEGISLATURE.

COMPOSITION OF IRISH LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Vide Clause 10, 1893, and 7th Schedule 1893.

6.—(1) (New) *The Irish Legislative Council shall consist of forty-eight councillors.*

(2) Each of the constituencies mentioned in the first schedule to this Act shall return the number of councillors named opposite thereto in that schedule.

(3) Every man shall be entitled to be registered as an elector, and when registered to vote at an election, of a councillor for a constituency, who owns or occupies any land or tenement in the constituency of a rateable value of more than twenty pounds, subject to the like conditions as a man is entitled at the

CONSTITUTION OF IRISH LEGISLATIVE BODY.

9.—(1) The Irish Legislative Body shall consist of a first and second order.

Vide Clauses 6 & 7, and 1st Schedule 1893.

(2) The two orders shall deliberate together, and shall vote together, except that, if any question arises in relation to legislation, or to the Standing Orders or Rules of Procedure, or to any other matter in that behalf in this Act specified, and such question is to be determined by vote, each order shall, if a majority of the members present of either order demand a separate vote, give their votes in like manner as if they were separate Legislative bodies; and if the result of the voting of the two

1893.	1886.
passing of this Act to be registered and vote as a parliamentary elector in respect of an ownership qualification or of the qualification specified in section five of the Representation of the People Act, 1884, as the case may be: Provided that a man shall not be entitled to be registered, nor if registered to vote, at an election of a councillor in more than one constituency in the same year.	orders does not agree, the question shall be resolved in the negative.
(4) The term of office of every councillor shall be eight years, and shall not be affected by a dissolution; and one half of the councillors shall retire in every fourth year, and their seats shall be filled by a new election.	
COMPOSITION OF IRISH LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.	FIRST ORDER.
Vide Clause 11, 1886, and 7th Schedule 1st 3. **7.**—(1) (New) *The Irish Legislative Assembly shall consist of one hundred and three members, returned by the existing Parliamentary constituencies in Ireland, or the existing divisions thereof, and elected by the Parliamentary electors for the time being in those constituencies or divisions.* (From the opposite.)	**10.**—(1) The first orders of the Irish Legislative Body shall consist of one hundred and three members, of whom seventy-five shall be elective members, and twenty-eight peerage members. Vide Clause 6 and 1st Schedul 1893.
(2) The Irish Legislative Assembly when summoned may, unless sooner dissolved, have continuance for five years from the day on which the summons directs it to meet, and no longer.	(2) Each elective member shall at the date of his election, and during his period of membership, be bonâ fide possessed of property which —
(3) (New) *After six years from the passing of this Act, the Irish Legislature may alter the qualification of the electors and the constituencies, and the distribution of the members of the constituencies, provided that in such distribution due regard is had to the population of the constituencies.*	(*a*) If realty, or partly realty and partly personalty, yields two hundred pounds a year or upwards, free of all charge; or
	(*b*) If personalty yields the same income, or is of the capital value of four thousand pounds or upwards, free of all charges.
DISAGREEMENT BETWEEN TWO HOUSES, HOW SETTLED.	(2) For the purpose of electing the elective members of the first order of the Legislative Body, Ireland shall be divided into the electoral districts specified in the First Schedule to this Act, and each such district shall return the number of members in that behalf specified in that schedule.
Vide Clause 2?, 1886. **8.**—If a Bill, or any provision of a Bill adopted by the Legislative Assembly, is lost by the disagreement of the Legislative Council, and after a dissolution, or the period of two years from such disagreement, such Bill, or a Bill for enacting the said provision, is again adopted by the Legislative Assembly	(3) The elective members shall be elected by the registered electors of each electoral district, and for that purpose a register of electors shall be made annually.
	(For continuation of Clause 10 see below.)
	LEGISLATIVE BODY.
	Vide Clauses, and 1st Schedule 1893. **23.**—If a Bill or any provision of a Bill is lost by disagreement between the two orders of the Legislative Body, and after a period ending with a dissolution of the Legislative Body, or the period of *three years* whichever period is longest, such Bill, or a Bill containing the said provision, is again considered by the Legislative Body, and such Bill or provision is adopted by the second order and negatived by the first order, the same shall be submitted to the whole Legislative Body, both orders of which shall vote together on the Bill or provision, and the same shall be adopted or

1893.

and fails within three months afterwards to be adopted by the Legislative Council, the same shall forthwith be submitted to the members of the two Houses deliberating and voting together thereon, and shall be adopted or rejected according to the decision of the majority of those members present and voting on the question.

RETENTION OF IRISH MEMBERS.

REPRESENTATION IN PARLIAMENT OF IRISH COUNTIES AND BOROUGHS.

Vide 2nd Schedule 1893.

9.—(New) *Unless and until Parliament otherwise determines, the following provisions shall have effect—*

(1) *After the appointed day each of the constituencies named in the second schedule to this Act shall return to serve in Parliament the number of members named opposite thereto in that schedule, and no more, and Dublin University shall cease to return any member.*

(2) *The existing divisions of the constituencies shall, save as provided in that schedule, be abolished.*

(3) *An Irish representative peer in the House of Lords and a member of the House of Commons for an Irish constituency shall not be entitled to deliberate or vote on—*

(a) *any Bill or motion in relation thereto the operation of which Bill or motion is confined to Great Britain or some part thereof; or*

(b) *any motion or resolution relating solely to some tax not raised or to be raised in Ireland; or*

(c) *any vote or appropriation of money made exclusively for some service not mentioned in the third schedule to this Act; or*

(d) *any motion or resolution exclusively affecting Great Britain or some part thereof or some local authority or some person or thing therein; or*

(e) *any motion or resolution, incidental to any such motion or resolution as either*

1886.

rejected according to the decision of the majority of the members so voting together.

CESSER OF POWER OF IRELAND TO RETURN MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT.

24.—On and after the appointed day Ireland shall cease, except in the event hereafter in this Act mentioned, to return representative peers to the House of Lords or members to the House of Commons, and the persons who on the said day are such representative peers and members shall cease as such to be members of the House of Lords and House of Commons respectively.

CONTINUATION OF CLAUSE X.

X. *continued*—(4) An elector in each electoral district shall be qualified as follows, that is to say, he shall be of full age, and not subject to any legal incapacity, and shall have been during the twelve months next preceding the twentieth day of July in any year the owner or occupier of some land or tenement within the district of a net annual value of twenty-five pounds or upwards.

(5) The term of office of an elective member shall be ten years.

(6) In every fifth year thirty-seven or thirty-eight of the elective members, as the case requires, shall retire from office, and their places shall be filled by election; the members to retire shall be those who have been members for the longest time without re-election.

(7) The offices of the peerage members shall be filled as follows, that is to say:—

(*a*) Each of the Irish peers who on the appointed day is one of the twenty-eight Irish representative peers, shall, on giving his written assent to the Lord Lieutenant, become a peerage member of the first order of the Irish Legislative Body; and if at any time within thirty years after the appointed day any such peer vacates his office by death or resignation, the vacancy shall be filled by

1893.	1886.
is last mentioned, or relates solely to some tax not raised or to be raised in Ireland, or incidental to any such vote or appropriation of money as aforesaid.	
(4) *Compliance with the provisions of this section shall not be questioned otherwise than in each House in manner provided by the House.*	
(5) *The election laws and the laws relating to the qualification of Parliamentary electors shall not, so far as they relate to Parliamentary elections, be altered by the Irish Legislature, but this enactment shall not prevent the Irish Legislature from dealing with any officers concerned with the issue of writs of election, and if any officers are so dealt with, it shall be lawful for her Majesty by Order in Council to arrange for the issue of such writs, and the writs issued in pursuance of such Order shall be of the same effect as if issued in manner heretofore accustomed.*	
	the election to that office by the Irish peers of one of their number in manner heretofore in use respecting the election of Irish representative peers, subject to adaptation as provided by this Act, and if the vacancy is not so filled within the proper time it shall be filled by the election of an elective member.
	(*b*) If any of the twenty-eight peers aforesaid does not within one month after the appointed day give such assent to be a peerage member of the first order, the vacancy so created shall be filled up as if he had assented and vacated his office by resignation.
	(3) A peerage member shall be entitled to hold office during his life, or until the expiration of thirty years from the appointed day, whichever period is the shortest. At the expiration of such thirty years the offices of all the peerage members shall be vacated as if they were dead, and their places shall be filled by elective members qualified and elected in manner provided by this Act with respect to elective members of the first order, and such elective members may be distributed by the Irish Legislature among the electoral districts, so, however that care shall be taken to give additional members to the most populous places.
	(9) The offices of members of the first order shall not be vacated by the dissolution of the Legislative Body.
	(10) The provisions in the Second Schedule to this Act relating to members of the first order of the Legislative Body shall be of the same force as if they were enacted in the body of this Act.

1886—*continued.*

SECOND ORDER.

Bill of 1886.

11.—(1) Subject as in this section hereafter mentioned, the second order of the Legislative Body shall consist of two hundred and four members. Vid Clause 7, 1893.

(2) The members of the second order shall be chosen by the existing constituencies of Ireland, two by each constituency, with the exception of the city of Cork, which shall be divided into two divisions in manner set forth in the Third Schedule to this Act, and two members shall be chosen by each of such divisions.

(3) Any person who, on the appointed day, is a member representing an existing Irish constituency in the House of Commons shall, on giving his written assent to the Lord Lieutenant, become a member of the second order of the Irish Legislative Body as if he had been elected by the constituency which he was representing in the House of Commons. Each of the members for the City of Cork, on the said day, may elect for which of the divisions of that city he wishes to be deemed to have been elected.

(4) If any member does not give such written assent within *one month* after the appointed day, his place shall be filled by election in the same manner and at the same time as if he had assented and vacated his office by death.

(5) If the same person is elected to both orders, he shall, within *seven days* after the meeting of the Legislative Body, or if the Body is sitting at the time of the election, within seven days after the election, elect in which order he will serve, and his membership of the other order shall be void, and be filled by a fresh election.

(6) Notwithstanding anything in this Act, it shall be lawful for the Legislature of Ireland at any time to pass an Act enabling the Royal University of Ireland to return not more than two members to the second order of the Irish Legislative Body in addition to the number of members above mentioned.

(7) Notwithstanding anything in this Act, it shall be lawful for the Irish Legislature, after the first dissolution of the Legislative Body which occurs, to alter the constitution or election of the second order of that body, due regard being had in the distribution of members to the population of the constituencies; provided that no alteration shall be made in the number of such order.

FINANCE.

1893.

AS TO SEPARATE CONSOLIDATED FUND AND TAXES.

Vide Clause 12, 1886, and 3rd Schedule 1893.

10.—(1) On and after the appointed day there shall be an Irish Exchequer and Consolidated Fund separate from those of the United Kingdom.

(2) The duties of customs and excise and the duties on postage shall be imposed by Act of Parliament, but subject to the provisions of this Act the Irish Legislature may, in order to provide for the public service of Ireland, impose any other taxes.

(3) Save as in this Act mentioned, all matters relating to the taxes in Ireland and the collection and management

1886.

TAXES AND SEPARATE CONSOLIDATED FUND.

Vide Clause 10 1893.

12.—(1) For the purpose of providing for the public service of Ireland the Irish Legislature may impose taxes, other than duties of customs or excise as defined by this Act, which duties shall continue to be imposed and levied by and under the direction of the Imperial Parliament only.

(2) On and after the appointed day there shall be an Irish Consolidated Fund separate from the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom.

(3) All taxes imposed by the Legislature of Ireland and all other public

1893.

thereof shall be regulated by Irish Act, and the same shall be collected and managed by the Irish Government and form part of the public revenues of Ireland : Provided that—

(*a*) the duties of customs shall be regulated, collected, managed and paid into the Exchequer of the United Kingdom as heretofore ; and

(*b*) all prohibitions in connection with the duties of excise, and so far as regards articles sent out of Ireland, all matters relating to those duties, shall be regulated by Act of Parliament ; and

(*c*) the excise duties on articles consumed in Great Britain shall be paid in Great Britain or to an officer of the Government of the United Kingdom.

(4) Save as in this Act mentioned, all the public revenues of Ireland shall be paid into the Irish Exchequer and form a Consolidated Fund, and be appropriated to the public service of Ireland by Irish Act.

(5) If the duties of excise are increased above the rates in force on the *first day of March, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-three*, the net proceeds in Ireland of the duties in excess of the said rates shall be paid from the Irish Exchequer to the Exchequer of the United Kingdom.

(6) If the duties of excise are reduced below the rates in force on the said day, and the net proceeds of such duties in Ireland are in consequence less than the net proceeds of the duties before the reduction, a sum equal to the deficiency shall, unless it is otherwise agreed between the Treasury and the Irish Government, be paid from the Exchequer of the United Kingdom to the Irish Exchequer.

HEREDITARY REVENUE AND INCOME TAX.

Vide Clauses 13, 14 & 15, 1886, and 3rd Schedule 1893.

11.—(1) The hereditary revenues of the Crown in Ireland which are managed by the Commissioners of Woods shall continue during the life of her present Majesty to be managed and collected by those Commissioners, and the net amount payable by them to the

1886.

revenues under the control of the Government of Ireland shall, subject to any provisions touching the disposal thereof contained in any Act passed in the present session respecting the sale and purchase of land in Ireland, be paid into the Irish Consolidated Fund, and be appropriated to the public service of Ireland according to law.

ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS FROM IRELAND TO CONSOLIDATED FUND OF UNITED KINGDOM.

Vide Clause 12, 1893, and 3rd Schedule 1893.

13.—(1) Subject to the provisions for the reduction or cesser thereof in this section mentioned, there shall be made on the part of Ireland to the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom the following annual contributions in every financial year ; that is to say—

(*a*) The sum of *one million four hundred and sixty-six thousand pounds* on account of the interest on and management of the Irish share of the National Debt :

(*b*) the sum of *one million six hundred and sixty-six thousand pounds* on account of the expenditure on the Army and Navy of the United Kingdom :

(*c*) The sum of *one hundred and ten thousand pounds* on account of the Imperial civil expenditure of the United Kingdom :

(*d*) The sum of *one million pounds* on account of the Royal Irish Constabulary and the Dublin Metropolitan Police.

(2) During the period of *thirty* years from this section taking effect, the said annual contribution shall not be increased, but may be reduced or cease as hereinafter mentioned. After the expiration of the said *thirty years* the said contributions shall, save as otherwise provided by this section, continue until altered in manner provided with respect to the alteration of this Act.

(3) The Irish share of the National Debt shall be reckoned at *forty-eight million pounds* Bank annuities, and there shall be paid in every financial year on behalf of Ireland to the Commissioners for the reduction of the

Vide Clause 1 1893.

1893.

Exchequer account of those revenues, after deducting all expenses (but including an allowance for interest on such proceeds of the sale of those revenues as have not been re-invested in Ireland), shall be paid into the Treasury Account (Ireland) hereinafter mentioned, for the benefit of the Irish Exchequer.

(2) A person shall not be required to pay income tax in Great Britain in respect of property situate or business carried on in Ireland, and a person shall not be required to pay income tax in Ireland in respect of property situate or business carried on in Great Britain.

(3) For the purpose of giving to Ireland the benefit of the difference between the Income Tax collected in Great Britain from British, colonial, and foreign securities held by residents in Ireland, and the Income Tax collected in Ireland from Irish securities held by residents in Great Britain, there shall be made to Ireland out of the Income Tax collected in Great Britain, an allowance of such amount as may be from time to time determined by the Treasury, in accordance with a minute of the Treasury laid before Parliament before the appointed day, and such allowance shall be paid into the Treasury Account (Ireland) for the benefit of the Irish Exchequer.

(4) Provided that the provisions of this section with respect to Income Tax shall not apply to any excess of the rate of Income Tax in Great Britain above the rate in Ireland or of the rate of Income Tax in Ireland above the rate in Great Britain.

FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS AS BETWEEN UNITED KINGDOM AND IRELAND.

Vide Clauses 13 & 14, 1886, and 3rd Schedule 1893.

12.—(1) The duties of Customs contributed by Ireland and, save as provided by this Act, that portion of any public revenue of the United Kingdom to which Ireland may claim to be entitled, whether specified in the third schedule of this Act or not, shall be carried to the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom, as the contribution of

1886.

National Debt an annual sum of *three hundred and sixty thousand pounds*, and the permanent annual charge for the National Debt on the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom shall be reduced by that amount, and the said annual sum shall be applied by the said Commissioners as a sinking fund for the redemption of the National Debt, and the Irish share of the National Debt shall be reduced by the amount of the National Debt so redeemed, and the said annual contribution on account of the interest on and management of the Irish share of the National Debt shall from time to time be reduced by a sum equal to the interest upon the amount of the National Debt from time to time so redeemed, but that last-mentioned sum shall be paid annually to the Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt in addition to the above-mentioned annual sinking fund, and shall be so paid and be applied as if it were part of that sinking fund.

(4) As soon as an amount of the National Debt equal to the said Irish share thereof has been redeemed under the provisions of this section, the said annual contribution on account of the interest on and management of the Irish share of the National Debt, and the said annual sum for a sinking fund, shall cease.

(5) If it appears to Her Majesty that the expenditure in respect of the army and navy of the United Kingdom, or in respect of Imperial civil expenditure of the United Kingdom, for any financial year has been less than *fifteen* times the amount of the contributions above-named on account of the same matter, a sum equal to *one-fifteenth* part of the diminution shall be deducted from the current annual contribution for the same matter.

(6) The sum paid from time to time by the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Woods, Forests, and Land Revenues to the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom on account of the hereditary revenues of the Crown in Ireland shall be credited to the Irish Government, and go in reduction of the said annual contribution payable on account of the Imperial civil expenditure of the United

1893.

Ireland to Imperial liabilities and expenditure as defined in that schedule.

(2) The civil charges of the Government in Ireland shall, subject as in this Act mentioned, be borne after the appointed day by Ireland.

(3) After *fifteen years* from the passing of this Act the arrangements made by this Act for the contribution of Ireland to Imperial liabilities and expenditure, and otherwise for the financial relations between the United Kingdom and Ireland, may be revised in pursuance of an address to Her Majesty from the House of Commons, or from the Irish Legislative Assembly.

1886.

Kingdom, but shall not be taken into account in calculating whether such diminution as above-mentioned has or has not taken place in such expenditure.

(7) If it appears to Her Majesty that the expenditure in respect of the Royal Irish Constabulary and the Dublin Metropolitan Police for any financial year has been less than the contribution above-named on account of such constabulary and police, the current contribution shall be diminished by the amount of such difference.

(8) This section shall take effect from and after *the thirty-first day of March, one thousand eight hundred and eighty-seven.*

COLLECTION AND APPLICATION OF CUSTOMS AND EXCISE DUTIES IN IRELAND.

1886—*continued.*

Bill of 1886.

14.—(1) On and after such day as the Treasury may direct all moneys from time to time collected in Ireland on account of the duties of customs or the duties of excise as defined by this Act shall, under such regulations as the Treasury from time to time make, be carried to a separate account (in this Act referred to as the customs and excise account) and applied in the payment of the following sums in priority as mentioned in this section, that is to say—

Vide Clause 12, 1893.

First, of such sum as is from time to time directed by the Treasury in respect of the costs, charges, and expenses of and incident to the collection and management of the said duties in Ireland not exceeding four per cent. of the amount collected there ;

Secondly, of the annual contributions required by this Act to be made to the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom.

Thirdly, of the annual sums required by this Act to be paid to the Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt ;

Fourthly, of all sums by this Act declared to be payable out of the moneys carried to the Customs and Excise account ;

Fifthly, of all sums due to the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom for interest or sinking fund, in respect of any loans made by the issue of bank annuities or otherwise to the Government of Ireland under any Act passed in the present session relating to the purchase and sale of land in Ireland, so far as such sums are not defrayed out of the moneys received under such Act.

1893—*continued.*

TREASURY ACCOUNT (IRELAND.)

Vide Clause 14, 1886, and 3rd Schedule 1893.

13.—(1) There shall be established under the direction of the Treasury an account (in this Act referred to as the Treasury account (Ireland)).

1886—*continued.*

(2) So much of the moneys carried to a separate account under this section as the Treasury consider are not, and are not likely to be required to meet the above-mentioned payments, shall from time to time be paid over and applied as part of the public revenues under the control of the Irish Government.

1893.

(2) There shall be paid into such account all sums payable from the Irish Exchequer to the Exchequer of the United Kingdom, or from the latter to the former Exchequer, and all sums directed to be paid into the account for the benefit of either of the said Exchequers.

(3) All sums, which are payable from either of the said Exchequers to the other of them, or being payable out of one of the said Exchequers are repayable by the other Exchequer, shall in the first instance be payable out of the said account so far as the money standing on the account is sufficient ; and for the purpose of meeting such sums, the Treasury out of the customs revenue collected in Ireland, and the Irish Government out of any of the public revenues in Ireland, may direct money to be paid to the Treasury Account (Ireland) instead of into the Exchequer.

(4) Any surplus standing on the account to the credit of either Exchequer, and not required for meeting payments, shall at convenient times be paid into that Exchequer, and where any sum so payable into the Exchequer of the United Kingdom is required by law to be forthwith paid to the National Debt Commissioners that sum may be paid to those Commissioners without being paid into the Exchequer.

(5) All sums payable by virtue of this Act out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom or of Ireland shall be payable from the Exchequer of the United Kingdom or Ireland, as the case may be, within the meaning of this Act, and all sums by this Act made payable from the Exchequer of the United Kingdom shall, if not otherwise paid, be charged on and paid out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom.

CHARGES ON IRISH CONSOLIDATED FUND.

Vide Clause 15, 1886, and 3rd Schedule 1893.

14.—(1) There shall be charged on the Irish Consolidated Fund in favour of the Exchequer of the United Kingdom as a first charge on that Fund all sums which—

1886.

CHARGES ON IRISH CONSOLIDATED FUND.

Vide Clause 14, 1893.

15.—(1) There shall be charged on the Irish Consolidated Fund in priority as mentioned in this section :—

First, such portion of the sums directed by this Act to be paid out of the moneys carried to the Customs and Excise account in priority to any payment for the public revenues of Ireland, as those moneys are insufficient to pay ;

Secondly, all sums due in respect of any debt incurred by the Government of Ireland, whether for interest, management, or sinking fund ;

Thirdly, all sums which at the passing of this Act are charged on the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom in respect of Irish services, other than the salary of the Lord Lieutenant ;

Fourthly, the salaries of all judges of the Supreme Court of Judicature or other superior court in Ireland, or of any county or other like court, who are appointed after the passing of the Act, and the pensions of such judges ;

Fifthly, any other sum charged by this Act on the Irish Consolidated Fund.

(2) It shall be the duty of the Legislature of Ireland to impose all such taxes, duties or imposts as will raise a sufficient revenue to meet all sums charged for the time being on the Irish Consolidated Fund.

IRISH CHURCH FUND.

Vide Clause 15 1893.

16.—Until all charges which are payable out of the Church property in Ireland, and are guaranteed by the Treasury, have been fully paid, the Irish Land Commission shall continue as heretofore to exist, with such Commissioners and officers receiving such salaries as the Treasury may from time to time appoint, and to admiuister the Church property and apply the income and other moneys receivable therefrom; and so much of the salaries of such Commissioners and officers and expenses of the office as is not paid out of the

1893.	1886.
(*a*) are payable to that Exchequer from the Irish Exchequer; or	Church property shall be paid out of the moneys carried to the Customs and Excise account under this Act, and if those moneys are insufficient, out of the Consolidated Fund of Ireland, and if not so paid, shall be paid out of moneys provided by Parliament.
(*b*) are required to repay to the Exchequer of the United Kingdom sums issued to meet the dividends or sinking fund on guaranteed land stock under the Purchase of Land (Ireland) Act, 1891, or	Provided as follows:—
(*c*) otherwise have been or are required to be paid out of the Exchequer of the United Kingdom in consequence of the non-payment thereof out of the Exchequer of Ireland or otherwise by the Irish Government.	(*a*) All charges on the Church Property for which a guarantee has been given by the Treasury before the passing of this Act shall, so far as they are not paid out of such property, be paid out of the moneys carried to the Customs and Excise account under this Act, and if such moneys are insufficient, the Consolidated Fund of Ireland, without prejudice nevertheless to the guarantee of the Treasury;
(2) If at any time the Controller and Auditor-General of the United Kingdom is satisfied that any such charge is due, he shall certify the amount of it, and the Treasury shall send such certificate to the Lord Lieutenant, who shall thereupon by order, without any countersignature, direct the payment of the amount from the Irish Exchequer to the Exchequer of the United Kingdom, and such order shall be duly obeyed by all persons, and until the amount is wholly paid no other payment shall be made out of the Irish Exchequer for any purpose whatever.	(*b*) All charges on the Church property, for which no guarantee has been given by the Treasury before the passing of this Act shall be charged on the Consolidated Fund of Ireland, but shall not be guaranteed by the Treasury nor charged on the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom.
(3) There shall be charged on the Irish Consolidated Fund next after the foregoing charge;	(2) Subject to any existing charges on the Church property, such property shall belong to the Irish Government and any portion of the annual revenue thereof which the Treasury, on the application of the Irish Government, certify at the end of any financial year not to be required for meeting charges, shall be paid over and applied as part of the public revenues under the control of the Irish Government.
(*a*) all sums, for dividends or sinking fund on guaranteed land stock under the Purchase of Land (Ireland) Act, 1891, which the Land Purchase Account and the Guarantee Fund under that Act are insufficient to pay;	(3) As soon as all charges on the Church property guaranteed by the Treasury have been paid, such property may be managed and administered, and subject to existing charges thereon disposed of, and the income or proceeds thereof applied in such manner as the Irish Legislature may from time to time direct.
(*b*) all sums due in respect of any debt incurred by the Government of Ireland, whether for interest, management, or sinking fund;	(4) "Church property" in this section means all property accruing under the Irish Church Act, 1869, and transferred
(*c*) an annual sum of *five thousand pounds* for the expenses of the household and establishment of the Lord Lieutenant;	
(*d*) all existing charges on the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom in respect of Irish services other than the salary of the Lord Lieutenant; and	
(*e*) the salaries and pensions of all Judges of the Supreme Court or other superior Court in Ireland or of any	

1893.	1886.
County or other like Court, who are appointed after the passing of this Act, and are not the Exchequer Judges hereafter mentioned.	to the Irish Land Commission by the Irish Church Act Amendment Act, 1881.
(4) Until all charges created by this Act upon the Irish Consolidated Fund and for the time being due are paid, no money shall be issued from the Irish Exchequer for any other purpose whatever.	
IRISH CHURCH FUND.	PUBLIC LOANS.
Vide Clause 16, 1886. **15.**—(1) All existing charges on the Church property in Ireland—that is to say, all property accruing under the Irish Church Act, 1869, and transferred to the Irish Land Commission by the Irish Church Amendment Act, 1881—shall so far as not paid out of the said property be charged on the Irish Consolidated Fund, and any of those charges guaranteed by the Treasury, if and so far as not paid, shall be paid out of the Exchequer of the United Kingdom.	**17.**—(1) All sums due for principal or interest to the Public Works Loan Commissioners or to the Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland in respect of existing loans advanced on any security in Ireland shall on and after the appointed day be due to the Government of Ireland, instead of the said Commissioners, and such body of persons as the Government of Ireland may appoint for the purpose shall have all the powers of the said Commissioners or their secretary for enforcing payment of such sums, and all securities for such sums given to such Commissioners or their secretary shall have effect as if the said body were therein substituted for those Commissioners or their secretary. Vide Clause 16, 1893.
(2) Subject to the existing charges thereon, the said Church property shall belong to the Irish Government, and be managed, administered, and disposed of as directed by Irish Act.	
LOCAL LOANS.	
Vide Clauses 16 & 17, 1886. **16.**—(1) All sums paid or applicable in or towards the discharge of the interest or principal of any local loan advanced before the appointed day on security in Ireland, or otherwise in respect of such loan, which but for this Act would be paid to the National Debt Commissioners, and carried to the Local Loan Fund, shall, after the appointed day, be paid, until otherwise provided by Irish Act, to the Irish Exchequer.	(2) For the repayment of the said loans to the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom the Irish Government shall pay annually into that fund by half-yearly payments on the first day of January and the first day of July, or on such other days as may be agreed on, such instalments of the principal of the said loans as will discharge all the loans within thirty years from the appointed day, and shall also pay interest half-yearly on so much of the said principal as from time to time remains unpaid at the rate of three per cent. per annum, and such instalments of principal and interest shall be paid out of the moneys carried to the Customs and Excise account under this Act, and if those are insufficient, out of the Consolidated Fund of Ireland.
(2) For the payment to the Local Loans Fund of the principal and interest of such loans the Irish Government shall after the appointed day pay by half-yearly payments an annuity for *forty-nine years*, at the rate of four per cent. on the principal of the said loans, exclusive of any sums written off before the appointed day from the account of assets of the Local Loans Fund, and	

1893.

such annuities shall be paid from the Irish Exchequer to the Exchequer of the United Kingdom and when so paid shall be forthwith paid to the National Debt Commissioners for the credit of the Local Loans Fund.

(3) After the appointed day, money for loans in Ireland shall cease to be advanced either by the Public Works Loan Commissioners or out of the Local Loans Fund.

ADAPTATION OF ACTS AS TO LOCAL TAXATION ACCOUNTS AND PROBATE, &c., DUTIES.

Vide 3rd Schedule 1893.

17.—(1) So much of any Act as directs payment to the Local Taxation (Ireland) Account of any share of probate, excise, or customs duties payable to the Exchequer of the United Kingdom shall, together with any enactment amending the same, be repealed as from the appointed day without prejudice to the adjustment of balances after that day; but the like amounts shall continue to be paid to the Local Taxation Accounts in England and Scotland as would have been paid if this Act had not passed, and any residue of the said share shall be paid into the Exchequer of the United Kingdom.

(2) The stamp duty chargeable in respect of the personalty of a deceased person shall not in the case of administration granted in Great Britain be chargeable in respect of any personalty situate in Ireland; nor in the case of administration granted in Ireland be chargeable in respect of any personalty situate in Great Britain; and any administration granted in Great Britain shall not, if re-sealed in Ireland, be exempt from stamp duty on administration granted in Ireland; and any administration granted in Ireland shall not, when re-sealed in Great Britain, be exempt from stamp duty on administration granted in Great Britain.

(3) In this section the expression "administration" means probate or letters of administration, and as respects Scotland, confirmation inclusive of the inventory required under the Acts relating to the said stamp duty; and the expression "personalty" means personal or movable estate and effects.

1886.

ADDITIONAL AID IN CASE OF WAR.

18.—If Her Majesty declares that a state of war exists, and is pleased to signify such declaration to the Irish Legislative Body by speech or message, it shall be lawful for the Irish Legislature to appropriate a further sum out of the Consolidated Fund of Ireland in aid of the army or navy, or other measures which Her Majesty may take for the prosecution of the war and defence of the realm, and to provide and raise money for that purpose; and all money so provided and raised, whether by loan, taxation, or otherwise, shall be paid into the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom.

MONEY BILLS AND VOTES.

Vide Clause 18, 1893.

19.—(1) It shall not be lawful for the Irish Legislative Body to adopt or pass any vote, resolution, address, or Bill for the raising or appropriation for any purpose of any part of the public revenue of Ireland, or of any tax, duty, or impost, except in pursuance of a recommendation from Her Majesty signified through the Lord Lieutenant in the Session in which such vote, resolution, address, or Bill is proposed.

(2) Notwithstanding that the Irish Legislature is prohibited by this Act for making laws relating to certain subjects, that Legislature may, with the assent of Her Majesty in Council first obtained, appropriate any part of the Irish

1893.	1886.
MONEY BILLS AND VOTES.	
Vide Clause 19, 1886. **18.**—(1) Bills for appropriating any part of the public revenue or for imposing any tax shall originate in the Legislative Assembly.	public revenue, or any tax, duty, or impost imposed by such Legislature, for the purpose of, or in connection with, such subjects.
(2) It shall not be lawful for the Legislative Assembly to adopt or pass any vote, resolution, address, or Bill for the appropriation for any purpose of any part of the public revenue of Ireland, or of any tax, except in pursuance of a recommendation from the Lord Lieutenant in the Session in which such vote, resolution, address, or Bill is proposed.	

EXCHEQUER DIVISION AND REVENUE ACTIONS.

EXCHEQUER JUDGES FOR REVENUE ACTIONS, ELECTION PETITIONS, &c.	EXCHEQUER DIVISION AND REVENUE ACTIONS.
Vide Clause 20, 1886, and 3rd Schedule **19.**—(1) Two of the Judges of the Supreme Court in Ireland shall be Exchequer Judges, and shall be appointed under the Great Seal of the United Kingdom; and their salaries and pensions shall be charged on and paid out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom.	**20.**—(1) On and after the appointed day, the Exchequer Division of the High Court of Justice shall continue to be a Court of Exchequer for revenue purposes under this Act, and whenever any vacancy occurs in the office of any judge of such Exchequer Division, his successor shall be appointed by Her Majesty on the joint recommendation of the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland and the Lord High Chancellor of Great Britain. Vide Clause 20, 1886.
(2) The Exchequer Judges shall be removable only by Her Majesty on address from the two Houses of Parliament, and each such Judge shall, save as otherwise provided by Parliament, receive the same salary and be entitled to the same pension as is at the time of his appointment fixed for the Puisne Judges of the Supreme Court, and during his continuance in office his salary shall not be diminished, nor his right to pension altered, without his consent.	(2) The judges of such Exchequer Division appointed after the passing of this Act shall be removable only by Her Majesty on address from the two Houses of the Imperial Parliament, and shall receive the same salaries and pensions as those payable at the passing of this Act to the existing judges of such Division, unless with the assent of Her Majesty in Council first obtained, the Irish Legislature alters such salaries or pensions, and such salaries and pensions shall be paid out of the moneys carried to the Customs and Excise account in pursuance of this Act, and if the same are insufficient shall be paid out of the Irish Consolidated Fund, and if not so paid shall be paid out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom.
(3) An alteration of any rules relating to such legal proceedings as are mentioned in this section shall not be made except with the approval of Her Majesty the Queen in Council; and the sittings of the Exchequer Judges shall be regulated with the like approval.	(3) An alteration of any rules relating to the procedure in such legal proceed-
(4) All legal proceedings in Ireland, which are instituted at the instance of or against the Treasury or Commissioners	

1893.	1886.
of Customs, or any of their officers, or relate to the election of members to serve in Parliament, or touch any matter not within the powers of the Irish Legislature, or touch any matter affected by a law which the Irish Legislature have not power to repeal or alter, shall, if so required by any party to such proceedings, be heard and determined before the Exchequer Judges or (except where the case requires to be determined by two judges) before one of them, and in any such legal proceeding an appeal shall, if any party so requires, lie from any Court of first instance in Ireland to the Exchequer Judges, and the decision of the Exchequer Judges shall be subject to appeal to Her Majesty the Queen in Council, and not to any other tribunal.	ings as are mentioned in this section shall not be made except with the approval of the Lord High Chancellor of Great Britain, and the sittings of the Exchequer Division and the judges thereof shall be regulated with the like approval.
(5) If it is made to appear to an Exchequer Judge that any decree or judgment in any such proceeding as aforesaid has not been duly enforced by the sheriff or other officer whose duty it is to enforce the same, such Judge shall appoint some officer whose duty it shall be to enforce that judgment or decree ; and for that purpose such officer and all persons employed by him shall be entitled to the same privileges, immunities, and powers as are by law conferred on a sheriff and his officers.	(4) All legal proceedings instituted in Ireland by or against the Commissioners or any officers of Custom or Excise, or the Treasury, shall, if so required by any party to such proceedings, be heard and determined before the judges of such Exchequer Division, or some or one of them, and any appeal from the decision in any such legal proceeding, if by a judge, shall lie to the said division, and if by the Exchequer Division, shall lie to the House of Lords, and not to any other tribunal ; and if it is made to appear to such judges, or any of them, that any decree or judgment in any such proceeding as aforesaid, has not been duly enforced by the sheriff or other officer whose duty it is to enforce the same, such judges or judge shall appoint some officer to enfore such judgment or decree ; and it shall be the duty of such officer to take proper steps to enforce the same, and for that purpose such officer and all persons employed by him shall be entitled to the same immunities, powers, and privileges as are by law conferred on a sheriff and his officers.
(6) The Exchequer Judges, when not engaged in hearing and determining such legal proceedings as above in this section mentioned, shall perform such of the duties ordinarily performed by other Judges of the Supreme Court in Ireland as may be assigned by her Majesty the Queen in Council.	
(7) All sums recovered by the Treasury or the Commissioners of Customs or any of their officers, or recovered under any Act relating to duties of customs, shall, notwithstanding anything in any other Act, be paid to such public account as the Treasury or the Commissioners direct.	(5) All sums recovered in respect of duties of Customs and Excise, or under any Act relating thereto, or by an officer of Customs or Excise shall, notwithstanding anything in any other Act, be paid to the Treasury, and carried to the Customs and Excise account under this Act.

POST OFFICE, POSTAL TELEGRAPHS, AND SAVINGS BANKS.

1893.

TRANSFER OF POST OFFICE AND POSTAL TELEGRAPHS.

Vide Clause 32, 1886, and 4th Schedule 1893.

20.—(1) As from *the appointed day* the postal and telegraph service in Ireland shall be transferred to the Irish Government, and may be regulated by Irish Act, except as in this Act mentioned and except as regards matters relating :—

(*a*) to such conditions of the transmission or delivery of postal packets and telegrams as are incidental to the duties on postage ; or

(*b*) to foreign mails or submarine telegraphs or through lines in connection therewith ; or

(*c*) to any other postal or telegraphic business in connection with places out of the United Kingdom.

(2) The administration of or incidental to the said excepted matters shall, save as may be otherwise arranged with the Irish Post Office, remain with the Postmaster-General.

(3) As regards the revenue and expenses of the postal and telegraph service, the Postmaster-General shall retain the revenue collected and defray the expenses incurred in Great Britain, and the Irish Post Office shall retain the revenue collected and defray the expenses incurred in Ireland, subject to the provisions of the Fourth Schedule to this Act ; which schedule shall have full effect, but may be varied or added to by agreement between the Postmaster-General and the Irish Post Office.

(4) *The sums payable by the Postmaster-General or Irish Post Office to the other of them in pursuance of this Act shall, if not paid out of Post Office moneys, be paid from the Exchequer of the United Kingdom or of Ireland, as the case requires, to the other Exchequer.*

(5) Sections 48 to 52 of the Telegraph Act, 1863, and any enactment amending the same, shall apply to all telegraphic lines of the Irish Government in like manner as to the telegraphs of a company within the meaning of that Act.

1886.

In the Bill of 1886 this subject was dealt with under the head of "*Miscellaneous*," as follows :—

POST OFFICE AND SAVINGS BANKS.

Vide Clauses 20 & 21, & Schedule 4, 1893

32. Whenever an Act of the Legislature of Ireland has provided for carrying on the postal and telegraphic service with respect to the transmission of letters and telegrams in Ireland, and the post office and other savings banks in Ireland, and for protecting the officers then in such service, and the existing depositors in such post office savings banks, the Treasury shall make arrangments for the transfer of the said service and banks, in accordance with the said Act, and shall give public notice of the transfer, and shall pay all depositors in such post office savings banks who request payment within *six months* after the date fixed for such transfer, and after the expiration of such *six months* the said depositors shall cease to have any claim against the Postmaster-General or the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom, but shall have the like claim against the Consolidated Fund of Ireland, and the Treasury shall cause to be transferred in accordance with the said Act the securities representing the sums due to the said depositors in post office savings banks and the securities held for other savings banks.

TRANSFER OF SAVINGS BANKS.

1893—*continued.*

21—(1.) As from the appointed day there shall be transferred to the Irish Government the Post Office savings banks in Ireland and all such powers and duties of any department or officer in Great Britain as are connected with Post Office savings banks, trustee savings banks, or friendly societies in Ireland, and the same may be regulated by Irish Act.

(2) The Treasury shall publish not less than six months previous notice of the transfer of savings banks.

(3) If before the date of the transfer any depositor in a Post Office savings bank so requests, his deposit shall, according to his request, either be paid to him or transferred to a Post Office savings bank in Great Britain, and after the said date the depositors in a Post Office savings bank in Ireland shall cease to have any claim against the Postmaster-General or the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom, but shall have the like claim against the Government and Consolidated Fund of Ireland;

(4) If before the date of the transfer the trustees of any trustee savings bank so request, then, according to the request, either all sums due to them shall be repaid and the savings bank closed, or those sums shall be paid to the Irish Government, and after the said date the trustees shall cease to have any claim against the National Debt Commissioners or the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom, but shall have the like claim against the Government and Consolidated Fund of Ireland.

(5) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, if a sum due on account of any annuity or policy of insurance which has before the above-mentioned notice been granted through a Post Office or trustee savings bank is not paid by the Irish Government, that sum shall be paid out of the Exchequer of the United Kingdom.

Bill of 1893.

THE DECISION OF CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTIONS.

1893.

IRISH APPEALS.

Vide Clause 25, 1886.

22.—(1) The appeal from Courts in Ireland to the House of Lords shall cease; and where any person would, but for this Act, have a right to appeal from any Court in Ireland to the House of Lords, such person shall have the like right to appeal to Her Majesty the Queen in Council; and the right so to appeal shall not be affected by any Irish Act; and all enactments relating to appeals to Her Majesty the Queen in Council, and to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council shall apply accordingly.

(2) When the Judicial Committee sit for hearing appeals from a Court in Ireland, there shall be present not less than four Lords of Appeal, within the meaning of the Appellate Jurisdiction Act, 1876, and at least one member who is

1886.

CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTIONS TO BE SUBMITTED TO JUDICIAL COMMITTEE.

25.—Questions arising as to the powers conferred on the Legislature of Ireland under this Act shall be determined as follows:— Vide Clause 22, 1893.

(*a*) If any such question arises on any Bill passed by the Legislative Body, the Lord Lieutenant may refer such question to Her Majesty in Council;

(*b*) If, in the course of any action or other legal proceeding, such question arises on any Act of the Irish Legislature any party to such action or other legal proceeding may, subject to the rules in this section mentioned, appeal from a decision on such question to Her Majesty in Council;

1893.

or has been a Judge of the Supreme Court in Ireland.

(3) A rota of Privy Councillors to sit for hearing appeals from Courts in Ireland shall be made annually by her Majesty in Council, and the Privy Councillors, or some of them, on that rota shall sit to hear the said appeals. A casual vacancy in such rota during the year may be filled by Order in Council.

(4) Nothing in this Act shall affect the jurisdiction of the House of Lords to determine the claims to Irish peerages.

SPECIAL PROVISION FOR DECISION OF CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTIONS.

Vide Clause 25, 1886.

23.—(1) If it appears to the Lord Lieutenant or a Secretary of State expedient in the public interest that steps shall be taken for the speedy determination of the question whether any Irish Act or any provision thereof is beyond the powers of the Irish Legislature, he may represent the same to Her Majesty in Council, and thereupon *the said question shall be forthwith referred to and heard and determined by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council*, constituted as if hearing an appeal from a Court in Ireland.

(2) Upon the hearing of the question such persons as seem to the Judicial Committee to be interested may be allowed to appear and be heard as parties to the case, and the decision of the Judicial Committee shall be given in like manner as if it were the decision of an appeal, the nature of the report or recommendation to Her Majesty being stated in open Court.

(3) Nothing in this Act shall prejudice any other power of Her Majesty in

1886.

(*c*) If any such question arises otherwise than as aforesaid on any Act of the Irish Legislature, the Lord Lieutenant or one of Her Majesty's principal Secretaries of State may refer such question to Her Majesty in Council;

(*d*) Any question referred or appeal brought under this section to Her Majesty in Council shall be referred for the consideration of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council;

(*e*) The decision of Her Majesty in Council on any question referred or appeal brought under this section shall be final, and a Bill which may be so decided to be, or contain a provision, in excess of the powers of the Irish Legislature shall not be assented to by the Lord Lieutenant; and a provision of any Act which is so decided to be in excess of the powers of the Irish Legislature shall be void;

(*f*) There shall be added to the Judicial Committee when sitting for the purpose of considering questions under this section, such members of Her Majesty's Privy Council, being or having been Irish judges, as to Her Majesty may seem meet;

(*g*) Her Majesty may, by Order in Council from time to time, make rules as to the cases and mode in which and the conditions under which, in pursuance of this section, questions may be referred and appeals brought to Her Majesty in Council, and as to the consideration thereof by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and any rules so made shall be of the same force as if they were enacted in this Act;

(*h*) An appeal shall not lie to the House of Lords in respect of any question in respect of which an appeal can be had to Her Majesty in Council in pursuance of this section.

The subject of the following Clauses not dealt with in the Bill of 1893:—

POWERS OF HER MAJESTY.

22.—On and after the appointed day there shall be reserved to Her Majesty—

(1) The power of erecting forts, magazines, arsenals, dockyards, and

1893.	1886.
Council to refer any question to the Judicial Committee or the right of any person to petition Her Majesty for such reference.	other buildings for military or naval purposes; (2) The power of taking waste land, and. on making due compensation, any other land, for the purpose of erecting such forts, magazines, arsenals, dockyards, or other buildings as aforesaid, and for any other military or naval purpose, or the defence of the realm.

LORD LIEUTENANTS AND CROWN LANDS.

OFFICE OF LORD LIEUTENANT.

Vide Clause 2', 1886.

24.—(1) Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in any Act, every subject of the Queen shall be qualified to hold the office of Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, without reference to his religious belief.

(2) The term of office of the Lord Lieutenant shall be six years, without prejudice to the power of her Majesty the Queen at any time to revoke the appointment.

USE OF CROWN LANDS BY IRISH GOVERNMENT.

Vide Clause 8, 1886.

25.—Her Majesty the Queen in council may place under the control of the Irish Government, for the purposes of that government, such of the lands and buildings in Ireland vested in or held in trust for her Majesty, and subject to such conditions or restrictions (if any), as may seem expedient.

OFFICE OF LORD LIEUTENANT.

26.—(1) Notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in any Act of Parliament, every subject of Her Majesty shall be eligible to hold and enjoy the office of Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, without reference to his religious belief. Vide Clause 24, 1893.

(2) The salary of the Lord Lieutenant shall continue to be charged on the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom, and the expenses of his household and establishment shall continue to be defrayed out of moneys to be provided by Parliament.

(3) All existing powers vested by Act of Parliament or otherwise in the Chief Secretary for Ireland may, if no such officer is appointed, be exercised by the Lord Lieutenant until other provision is made by Act of the Irish Legislature.

(4) The Legislature of Ireland shall not pass any Act relating to the office or functions of the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland.

JUDGES AND CIVIL SERVANTS.

TENURE OF FUTURE JUDGES.

Vide Clause 27, 1886.

26.—A Judge of the Supreme Court or other superior court in Ireland, or of any County Court or other Court with a like jurisdiction in Ireland, appointed after the passing of this Act, shall not be removed from his office except in pursuance of an address from the two Houses of the Legislature of Ireland, nor during his continuance in office

JUDGES TO BE REMOVABLE ONLY BY ADDRESS.

27.—A Judge of the Supreme Court of Judicature or other Superior Court of Ireland, or of any County Court or other Court with a like jurisdiction in Ireland, appointed after the passing of this Act, shall not be removed from his office except in pursuance of an address to Her Majesty from both orders of the Vide Clause 25, 1886.

1893.	1886.
shall his salary be diminished or right to pension altered without his consent.	Legislative Body voting separately, nor shall his salary be diminished, or right to pension altered during his continuance in office.
AS TO EXISTING JUDGES AND OTHER PERSONS HAVING SALARIES CHARGED ON THE CONSOLIDATED FUND.	PROVISION AS TO JUDGES AND OTHER PERSONS HAVING SALARIES CHARGED ON THE CONSOLIDATED FUND.
Vide Clause 23, 1886. **27.**—(1) All existing Judges of the Supreme Court, County Court Judges, and Land Commissioners in Ireland, and all existing officers serving in Ireland in the permanent Civil Service of the Crown and receiving salaries charged on the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom, shall, if they are removable at present on address from both Houses of Parliament, continue to be removable only upon such address, and if removable in any other manner shall continue to be removable only in the same manner as heretofore ; and shall continue to receive the same salaries, gratuities, and pensions, and to be liable to perform the same duties as heretofore, or such duties as her Majesty may declare to be analogous, and their salaries and pensions, if and so far as not paid out of the Irish Consolidated Fund, shall be paid out of the Exchequer of the United Kingdom: Provided that this section shall be subject to the provisions of this Act with respect to the Exchequer Judges.	Vid Clause 27, 1893. **28.**—(1) All persons who at the passing of this Act are Judges of the Supreme Court of Judicature or County Court Judges, or hold any other judicial position in Ireland, shall, if they are removable at present on address to Her Majesty of both Houses of Parliament, continue to be removable only upon such address from both Houses of the Imperial Parliament, and if removable in any other manner shall continue to be removable in like manner as heretofore ; and such persons, and also all persons at the passing of this Act in the permanent civil service of the crown in Ireland whose salaries are charged on the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom, shall continue to hold office and to be entitled to the same salaries, pensions, and superannuation allowances as heretofore, and to be liable to perform the same or analogous duties as heretofore ; and the salaries of such persons shall be paid out of the moneys carried to the customs and excise account under this Act, or if these moneys are insufficient, out of the Irish Consolidated Fund, and if the same are not so paid, shall continue charged on the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom.
(2) If any of the said Judges, Commissioners or Officers retires from office with the Queen's approbation before completion of the period of service entitling him to a pension, her Majesty may, if she thinks fit, grant to him such pension, not exceeding the pension to which he would on that completion have been entitled, as to her Majesty seems meet.	(2) *If any of the said persons retires from office with the approbation of Her Majesty before he has completed the period of service entitling him to a pension, it shall be lawful for Her Majesty, if she thinks fit, to grant to that person such pension, not exceeding the pension to which he would have been entitled if he had completed the said period of service, as to Her Majesty seems meet.*
AS TO PERSONS HOLDING CIVIL SERVICE APPOINTMENTS.	AS TO PERSONS HOLDING CIVIL SERVICE APPOINTMENTS.
Vide Clause 29, 1886. **28.**—(1) All existing officers in the permanent Civil Service of the Crown, who are not above provided for, and are at the appointed day serving in Ireland, shall after that day continue to hold their offices by the same tenure and to receive the same salaries, gratuities, and pensions and to be liable to perform the same duties as heretofore or such duties	Vide Clause 28, 1893. **29.**—(1) All persons not above provided for and at the passing of this Act serving in Ireland in the permanent civil service of the Crown shall continue

1893.

as the Treasury may declare to be analogous ; *and the said gratuities and pensions, and until three years after the passing of this Act, the salaries due to any of the said officers if remaining in his existing office, shall be paid to the payees by the Treasury out of the Exchequer of the United Kingdom.*

(2) Any such officer may, after *three years* from the passing of this Act, retire from office, and shall, at any time during those three years, if required by the Irish Government, retire from office, and on any such retirement may be awarded by the Treasury a gratuity or pension in accordance with the Fifth Schedule to this Act ; provided that—

(*a*) six months' written notice shall, unless it is otherwise agreed, be given either by the said officer or by the Irish Government as the case requires ; and

(*b*) such number of officers only shall retire at one time and at such intervals of time as the Treasury, in communication with the Irish Government, sanction.

(3) If any such officer does not so retire, the Treasury may award him after the said three years a pension in accordance with the Fifth Schedule to this Act which shall become payable to him on his ultimate retirement from the service of the Crown.

(4.) The gratuities and pensions awarded in accordance with the Fifth Schedule to this Act shall be paid by the Treasury to the payees out of the Exchequer of the United Kingdom.

(5) All sums paid out of the Exchequer of the United Kingdom in pursuance of this section shall be repaid to that Exchequer from the Irish Exchequer.

(6) This section shall not apply to officers retained in the service of the Government of the United Kingdom.

AS TO EXISTING PENSIONS AND SUPERANNUATION ALLOWANCES.

Vide Clause 30, 1886.

29.—Any existing pension granted on account of service in Ireland as a Judge of the Supreme Court or of any Court consolidated into that court, or as a County Court Judge, or in any other judicial position, or as an officer in the permanent Civil Service of the Crown other than in an office the holder of

1886.

to hold their offices and receive the same salaries, and to be entitled to the same gratuities and superannuation allowances as heretofore, and shall be liable to perform the same duties as heretofore or duties of similar rank, but any of such persons shall be entitled at the expiration of *two years* after the passing of this Act to retire from office, and at any time if required by the Irish Government shall retire from office, and on any such retirement shall be entitled to receive such payment as the Treasury may award to him in accordance with the provisions contained in the Fourth Schedule to this Act.

(2) The amount of such payment shall be paid to him out of the moneys carried to the customs and excise account under this Act, or, if those moneys are insufficient, out of the Irish Consolidated Fund, *and so far as the same are not so paid shall be paid out of moneys provided by Parliament.*

(3) The Pensions Commutation Act, 1871, shall apply to all persons who, having retired from office, are entitled to any annual payment under this section, in like manner as if they had retired in consequence of the abolition of their offices.

(4) This section shall not apply to persons who are retained in the service of the Imperial Government.

PROVISION FOR EXISTING PENSIONS AND SUPERANNUATION ALLOWANCES.

Vide Clause 29, 1893.

30.—Where before the passing of this Act any Pension or superannuation allowance has been granted to any person on account of service as a judge of the Supreme Court of Judicature of Ireland or of any court consolidated into that court, or as a County Court Judge, or in any other judicial position, or on account of service in the permanent civil service of the Crown in Ireland otherwise than in some office the holder of which is, after the passing of this Act, retained in the service of the Imperial Government, such pension or allowance, whether payable out of the Consolidated Fund or out of moneys provided by Parliament, shall continue to be paid to such person, and shall be so paid out of the moneys carried to the customs and

1893.	1886.
which is after the appointed day retained in the service of the Government of the United Kingdom, shall be charged on the Irish Consolidated Fund, and if and so far as not paid out of that fund, shall be paid out of the Exchequer of the United Kingdom.	excise account under this Act, or, if such moneys are insufficient, out of the Irish Consolidated Fund, and so far as the same is not so paid, shall be paid as heretofore out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom or moneys provided by Parliament.

POLICE.

Vide Clause 21, 1886, and Schedule 6, 1893.

30.—(1) The forces of the Royal Irish Constabulary and Dublin Metropolitan Police shall, when and as local police forces are from time to time established in Ireland in accordance with the Sixth Schedule to this Act, be gradually reduced and ultimately cease to exist as mentioned in that schedule; and after the passing of this Act no officer or man shall be appointed to either of those forces;

Provided that until the expiration of six years from the appointed day nothing in this Act shall require the Lord Lieutenant to cause either of the said forces to cease to exist, if as representing Her Majesty the Queen he considers it inexpedient.

(2) The said two forces shall, while they continue, be subject to the control of the Lord Lieutenant as representing Her Majesty, and the members thereof shall continue to receive the same salaries, gratuities, and pensions, and hold their appointments on the same tenure as heretofore, and *those salaries, gratuities, and pensions, and all the expenditure incidental to either force, shall be paid out of the Exchequer of the United Kingdom.*

(3) When any existing member of either force retires under the provisions of the Sixth Schedule to this Act, the Treasury may award to him a gratuity or pension in accordance with that schedule.

(4) Those gratuities and pensions, and all existing pensions payable in respect of service in either force, shall be paid by the Treasury to the payees out of the Exchequer of the United Kingdom.

(5) Two-thirds of the net amount payable in pursuance of this section out of the Exchequer of the United Kingdom shall be repaid to that Exchequer from the Irish Exchequer.

Under the Bill of 1886 this subject was dealt with in Clause 21, as follows:—

Vide Clause 30, 1893, and Schedule 6, 1893.

21.—The following regulations shall be made with respect to police in Ireland:

(a) The Dublin Metropolitan Police shall continue and be subject as heretofore to the control of the Lord Lieutenant as representing Her Majesty for a period of *two years* from the passing of this Act, and thereafter until any alteration is made by Act of the Legislature of Ireland, but such Act shall provide for the proper saving of all then existing interests, whether as regards pay, pensions, superannuation allowances, or otherwise.

(b) The Royal Irish Constabulary shall, while that force subsists, continue and be subject as heretofore to the control of the Lord Lieutenant as representing Her Majesty.

(c) The Irish Legislature may provide for the establishment and maintenance of a police force in counties and boroughs in Ireland under the control of local authorities, and arrangements may be made between the Treasury and the Irish Government for the establishment and maintenance of police reserves.

MISCELLANEOUS—AUDIT.

1893.

IRISH EXCHEQUER CONSOLIDATED FUND AND AUDIT.

Vide Clause 33 1886.

31.—Save as may be otherwise provided by Irish Act—

(*a*) The existing law relating to the Exchequer and Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom shall apply with the necessary modifications to the Exchequer and Consolidated Fund of Ireland, and an officer shall be appointed by the Lord Lieutenant to be the Irish Comptroller and Auditor-General; and

(*b*) The accounts of the Irish Consolidated Fund shall be audited as appropriation accounts in manner provided by the Exchequer and Audit Departments Act, 1866, by or under the direction of such officer.

1886.

33.—Save as otherwise provided by the Irish Legislature,— Vide Clause 31, 1893.

(*a*) The existing law relating to the Exchequer and the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom shall apply to the Irish Exchequer and Consolidated Fund, and an officer shall from time to time be appointed by the Lord Lieutenant to fill the office of the Comptroller General of the receipt and issue of Her Majesty's Exchequer and Auditor General of public accounts so far as respects Ireland; and

(*b*) The accounts of the Irish Consolidated Fund shall be audited as appropriation accounts in manner provided by the Exchequer and Audit Departments Act, 1866, by or under the direction of the holder of such office.

PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES.

1893.

LAW APPLICABLE TO BOTH HOUSES OF IRISH LEGISLATURE.

Vide Clause 24, 1886.

32.—(1) Subject as in this Act mentioned, and particularly to the Seventh Schedule to this Act (which Schedule shall have full effect) all existing election laws relating to the House of Commons and the members thereof, shall, so far as applicable, extend to each of the two Houses of the Irish Legislature and the members thereof, but such election laws so far as hereby extended may be altered by Irish Act.

(2) The privileges, rights, and immunities to be held and enjoyed by each House and the members thereof shall be such as may be defined by Irish Act, but so that the same shall never exceed those for the time being held and enjoyed by the House of Commons, and the members thereof.

SUPPLEMENTAL PROVISIONS AS TO POWERS OF IRISH LEGISLATURE.

Vide Clause 24, 1886.

33.—(1) The Irish Legislature may repeal or alter any provision of this Act which is by this Act expressly made alterable by that Legislature, and also

1886.

APPLICATION OF PARLIAMENTARY LAW.

34.—(1) The privileges, immunities, and powers to be held, enjoyed, and exercised by the Irish Legislative Body, and the members thereof, shall be such as are from time to time defined by Act of the Irish Legislature, but so that the same shall never exceed those at the passing of this Act, held, enjoyed, and exercised by the House of Commons, and by the members thereof. Vide Clauses 32 and 33, 1893.

(2) Subject as in this Act mentioned, all existing laws and customs relating to the members of the House of Commons and their election, including the enactments respecting the questioning of elections, corrupt and illegal practices, and registration of electors, shall, so far as applicable, extend to elective members of the first order and to members of the second order of the Irish Legislative Body.

Provided that— Vide Clauses 32 and 33, 1893.

(*a*) The law relating to the offices of profit enumerated in Schedule H. to the Representation of the People Act, 1867, shall apply to such offices of profit in

1893.	1886.
any enactments in force in Ireland, except such as either relate to matters beyond the powers of the Irish Legislature, or being enacted by Parliament after the passing of this Act may be expressly extended to Ireland. An Irish Act, notwithstanding it is in any respect repugnant to any enactment excepted as aforesaid, shall, though read subject to that enactment, be, except to the extent of that repugnancy, valid.	the government of Ireland not exceeding ten, as the Legislature of Ireland may from time to time direct ;
(2) An order, rule, or regulation, made in pursuance of, or having the force of an Act of Parliament, shall be deemed to be an enactment within the meaning of this section.	*(b)* After the first dissolution of the Legislative Body, the Legislature of Ireland may, subject to the restrictions in this Act mentioned, alter the laws and customs in this section mentioned.
(3) Nothing in this Act shall affect Bills relating to the divorce or marriage of individuals, and any such Bill shall be introduced and proceed in Parliament in like manner as if this Act had not passed.	

THE POWER TO BORROW MONEY.

1893.—*continued.*

LIMITATION ON BORROWING BY LOCAL AUTHORITIES.

34.—The local authority for any county or borough or other area shall not borrow money without either—

(*a*) special authority from the Irish Legislature, or

(*b*) the sanction of the proper department of the Irish Government; and shall not, without such special authority, borrow;

(i) in the case of a municipal borough or town or area less than a county, any loan which together with the then outstanding debt of the local authority, will exceed twice the annual rateable value of the property in the municipal borough, town, or area; or

(ii.) in the case of a county or larger area, any loan which together with the then outstanding debt of the local authority, will exceed one-tenth of the annual rateable value of the property in the county or area; or

(iii) in any case a loan exceeding one half of the above limits without a local inquiry held in the county, borough, or area by a person appointed for the purpose by the said department

Bill of 1893.

TRANSITORY PROVISIONS.

1893 —*continued.*

TEMPORARY RESTRICTION ON POWERS OF IRISH LEGISLATURE AND EXECUTIVE.

Vide Clause 31, 1886.

35—(1) During three years from the passing of this Act, and if Parliament is then sitting until the end of that

1886.—*continued.*

In the Bill of 1886 these provisions are dealt with in Clause 31, as follows:—

31.—The provisions contained in the Fifth Schedule to this Act relating to the mode in which arrangements are to be made for setting in motion the Irish

Vide Clause 35 1893.

1893.	1886.
session of Parliament, the Irish Legislature shall not pass an Act respecting the relations of landlord and tenant, or the sale, purchase, or letting of land generally; Provided that nothing in this section shall prevent the passing of any Irish Act with a view to the purchase of land for railways, harbours, waterworks, town improvements, or other local undertakings.	Legislative Body and Government and for the transfer to the Irish Government of the powers and duties to be transferred to them under this Act, or for otherwise bringing this Act into operation, shall be of the same effect as if they were enacted in the body of this Act.
(2) During six years from the passing of this Act, the appointment of a Judge of the Supreme Court or other superior Court in Ireland (other than one of the Exchequer Judges) shall be made in pursuance of a warrant from Her Majesty countersigned as heretofore.	

REGULATIONS FOR CARRYING THE ACT INTO EFFECT.

TRANSITORY PROVISIONS.

Vide Clause 35, 1886.

36.—(1) Subject to the provisions of this Act Her Majesty the Queen in Council may make or direct such arrangements as seem necessary or proper for setting in motion the Irish Legislature and Government and for otherwise bringing this Act into operation.

(2) The Irish Legislature shall be summoned to meet on *the first Tuesday in September, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-four*, and the first election of members of the two Houses of the Irish Legislature shall be held at such time before that day as may be fixed by Her Majesty in Council.

(3) Upon the first meeting of the Irish Legislature the members of the House of Commons then sitting for Irish constituencies, including the members for Dublin University, shall vacate their seats, and writs shall, as soon as conveniently may be, be issued by the Lord Chancellor of Ireland for the purpose of holding an election of members to serve in Parliament for the constituencies named in the Second Schedule of this Act.

(4) The existing Chief Baron of the Exchequer, and the senior of the existing puisne Judges of the Exchequer Division of the Supreme Court, or if

Vide Clause 35, 1886.

35.—(1.) The Lord Lieutenant of Ireland may make regulations for the following purposes :—

(*a*) The summoning of the Legislative Body and the election of a Speaker, and such adaptation to the proceedings of the Legislative Body of the procedure of the House of Commons as appears to him expedient for facilitating the conduct of business by that body on their first meeting ;

(*b*) The adaptation of any law relating to the election of representative peers ;

(*c*) The adaptation of any laws and customs relating to the House of Commons or the members thereof to the elective members of the first order and to members of the second order of the Legislative body ; and

(*d*) The mode of signifying their assent or election under this Act by representative peers or Irish members of the House of Commons as regards becoming members of the Irish Legislative Body in pursuance of this Act.

(2) Any regulations so made shall, in so far as they concern the procedure of the Legislative Body, be subject to alteration by Standing Orders of that Body, and so far as they concern other matters, be subject to alteration by the

1893.

they or either of them are or is dead or unable or unwilling to act, such other of the Judges of the Supreme Court as Her Majesty may appoint, shall be the first Exchequer Judges.

(5) Where it appears to Her Majesty the Queen in Council, before the expiration of one year after the appointed day, that any existing enactment respecting matters within the powers of the Irish Legislature requires adaptation to Ireland, whether—

(*a*) by the substitution of the Lord Lieutenant in Council, or of any department or officer of the Executive Government in Ireland, for Her Majesty in Council, a Secretary of State, the Treasury, the Postmaster-General, the Board of Inland Revenue, or other public department or officer in Great Britain; or

(*b*) by the substitution of the Irish Consolidated Fund or moneys provided by the Irish Legislature for the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom, or moneys provided by Parliament; or

(*c*) by the substitution of confirmation by, or other act to be done by or to, the Irish Legislature for confirmation by or other act to be done by or to Parliament; or

(*d*) by any other adaptation;

Her Majesty, by order in Council, may make that adaptation.

(6) Her Majesty the Queen in Council may provide for the transfer of such property, rights, and liabilities, and the doing of such other things as may appear to Her Majesty necessary or proper for carrying into effect this Act or any Order in Council under this Act.

(7) An Order in Council under this section may make an adaptation or provide for a transfer either unconditionally or subject to such exceptions, conditions, and restrictions as may seem expedient.

(8) The draft of every Order in Council under this section shall be laid

1886.

Legislature of Ireland, but shall, until alteration, have the same effect as if they were inserted in this Act.

SAVING OF POWERS OF HOUSE OF LORDS.

36.—Save as in this Act provided with respect to matters to be decided by Her Majesty in Council, nothing in this Act shall affect the appellate jurisdiction of the House of Lords in respect of actions and suits in Ireland, or the jurisdiction of the House of Lords to determine the claims to Irish peerages.

Vide Clause 30, 1893.

SAVING OF RIGHTS OF PARLIAMENT.

37.—Save as herein expressly provided all matters in relation to which it is not competent for the Irish Legislative Body to make or repeal laws shall remain and be within the exclusive authority of the Imperial Parliament save as aforesaid, whose power and authority in relation thereto shall in

Vide Clause 36 1893.

1893.	1886.
before both Houses of Parliament for not less than two months before it is made, and such order when made shall, subject as respects Ireland to the provisions of an Irish Act, have full effect, but shall not interfere with the continued application to any place, authority, person, or thing, not in Ireland, of the enactment to which the Order relates.	nowise be diminished or restrained by anything herein contained.

CONTINUANCE OF EXISTING LAWS, COURTS, OFFICERS, ETC.

Vide Clause 38, 1886.

37.—Except as otherwise provided by this Act, all existing laws, institutions, authorities and officers in Ireland, whether judicial, administrative or ministerial, and all existing taxes in Ireland shall continue as if this Act had not passed, but with the modifications necessary for adapting the same to this Act, and subject to be repealed, abolished, altered and adapted in the manner and to the extent authorized by this Act.

Vide Clause 38, 1886.

38.—Subject as in this Act mentioned, the appointed day for the purposes of this Act shall be the day of the first meeting of the Irish Legislature, or such other day not more than seven months earlier or later as may be fixed by order of her Majesty in Council either generally or with reference to any particular provision of this Act, and different days may be appointed for different purposes and different provisions of this Act, whether contained in the same section or in different sections.

Vide Clause 37, 1893.

38.—(1) Except as otherwise provided by this Act, all existing laws in force in Ireland, and all existing courts of civil and criminal jurisdiction, and all existing legal commissions, powers, and authorities, and all existing officers, judicial, administrative, and ministerial, and all existing taxes, licence and other duties, fees and other receipts in Ireland shall continue as if this Act had not been passed; subject, nevertheless, to be repealed, abolished, or altered in manner and to the extent provided by this Act; provided that, subject to the provisions of this Act, such taxes, duties, fees, and other receipts shall, after the appointed day, form part of the public revenues of Ireland.

(2) The Commissioners of Inland Revenue and the Commissioners of Customs, and the officers of such Commissioners respectively, shall have the same powers in relation to any articles subject to any duty of excise or customs, manufactured, imported, kept for sale, or sold, and any premises where the same may be, and to any machinery, apparatus, vessels, utensils, or conveyance used in connexion therewith, or the removal thereof, and in relation to the person manufacturing, importing, keeping for sale, selling, or having the custody or possession of the same as they would have had if this Act had not been passed.

MODE OF ALTERATION OF ACT.

1886—*continued.*

Bill of 1886.

Vide Clauses 23 & 35, 1893.

39.—(1) On and after the appointed day this Act shall not, except such provisions thereof as are declared to be alterable by the Legislature of Ireland, be altered except—

(*a*) by Act of the Imperial Parliament and with the consent of the Irish Legislative Body testified by an address to Her Majesty, or

(*b*) by an Act of the Imperial Parliament, for the passing or which there shall be summoned to the House of Lords the peerage members of the first order of the Irish Legislative Body, and if there are no such members then twenty-eight Irish representative peers elected by the Irish peers in manner heretofore in use, subject to adaptation as provided by this Act, and there shall be summoned to the House of Commons such one of the members of each constituency, or in the case of a constituency returning four members such two of those members, as the Legislative Body of Ireland may select, and such peers and members shall respectively be deemed, for the purpose of passing any such Act, to be members of the said Houses of Parliament respectively.

(2) For the purposes of this section it shall be lawful for Her Majesty by Order in Council to make such provisions for summoning the said peers of Ireland to the House of Lords and the said members from Ireland to the House of Commons as to Her Majesty may seem necessary or proper, and any provisions contained in such Order in Council shall have the same effect as if they had been enacted by Parliament.

DEFINITIONS.

1893.

Vide Clause 40, 1886.

39.—In this Act, unless the context otherwise requires—

The expression "existing" means existing at the passing of this Act.

The expression "constituency" means a Parliamentary constituency or a county or borough returning a member or members to serve in either House of the Irish Legislature, as the case requires, and the expression "Parliamentary constituency" means any county, borough, or university returning a member or members to serve in Parliament.

The expression "Parliamentary elector" means a person entitled to be registered as a voter at a Parliamentary election.

The expression "Parliamentary election" means the election of a member to serve in Parliament.

The expression "tax" includes duties and fees, and the expression "duties of excise does not include license duties.

The expression "foreign mails"

1886.

Vide Clause 39, 1893.

40.—In this Act—

The expression "the appointed day" shall mean such day after the *thirty-first day of March in the year one thousand eight hundred and eighty seven* as may be determined by order of Her Majesty in Council.

The expression "Lord Lieutenant" includes the lords justices or any other chief governor or governors of Ireland for the time being.

The expression "Her Majesty the Queen," or "Her Majesty," or "The Queen," includes the heirs and successors of Her Majesty the Queen.

The expression "Treasury" means the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury.

The expression "Treaty" includes any convention or arrangement.

The expression "existing" means existing at the passing of this Act.

The expression "existing constituency" means any county or borough, or

1893.

means all postal packets, whether letters, parcels, or other packets, posted in the United Kingdom, and sent to a place out of the United Kingdom, or posted in a place out of the United Kingdom and sent to a place in the United Kingdom, or in transit through the United Kingdom to a place out of the United Kingdom.

The expression "telegraphic line" has the same meaning as in the Telegraph Acts, 1863 to 1892.

The expression "duties on postage" includes all rates and sums chargeable for or in respect of postal packets, money orders, or telegrams, or otherwise, under the Post Office Acts or the Telegraph Act, 1892.

The expression "Irish Act" means a law made by the Irish Legislature.

The expression "election laws" means the laws relating to the election of members to serve in Parliament, other than those relating to the qualification of electors, and includes all the laws respecting the registration of electors, the issue and execution of writs, the creation of polling districts, the taking of the poll, the questioning of elections, corrupt and illegal practices, the disqualification of members, and the vacating of seats.

The expression "rateable value" means the annual rateable value under the Irish Valuation Acts.

The expression "salary" includes remuneration, allowances, and emoluments.

The expression "pension" includes superannuation allowance.

SHORT TITLE.

40.—This Act may be cited as the Irish Government Act, 1893.

1886.

division of a county or borough, or a University, returning at the passing of this Act a member or members to serve in Parliament.

The expression "duties of excise" does not include a duty received in respect of any license whether for the sale of intoxicating liquors or otherwise.

The expression "financial year" means the twelve months ending on the *thirty-first day of March*.

SHORT TITLE OF ACT.

41.—This Act may be cited for all purposes as the Irish Government Act, 1886.

THE SCHEDULES OF 1893.*

The only material afforded for comparison with any portion of the Schedules in the Bill of 1893 is provided in

SECTIONS 23 & 24 OF THE BILL OF 1886,

and has reference to the *Legislative Body*.* These two Sections may be read in juxta-position with *Schedule 7 of the Bill of* 1893, which has reference to the same subject :—

FIRST SCHEDULE.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Vide Clauses 6 9, 10 & 23, 1886.

CONSTITUENCIES AND NUMBER OF COUNCILLORS.

Constituencies.	Councillors.	Constituencies.	Councillors.
Antrim county	Three	Leitrim and Sligo counties	One
Armagh county	One	Limerick county	Two
Belfast borough	Two	Londonderry county ...	One
Carlow county	One	Longford county	One
Cavan county	One	Louth county	One
Clare county	One	Mayo county	One
Cork county—East Riding ...	Three	Meath county	One
,, West Riding...	One	Monaghan county... ...	One
Cork borough	One	Queen's county	One
Donegal county	One	Roscommon county ...	One
Down county...	Three	Tipperary county	Two
Dublin county	Three	Tyrone county	One
Dublin borough	Two	Waterford county	One
Fermanagh county	One	Westmeath county ...	One
Galway county	Two	Wexford county	One
Kerry county...	One	Wicklow county	One
Kildare county	One		
Kilkenny county	One		Forty-eight.
King's county	One		

The expression "borough" in this schedule means an existing Parliamentary borough.

Counties of cities and towns not named in this schedule shall be combined with the county at large in which they are included for Parliamentary elections, and if not so included, then with the county at large bearing the same name.

A borough named in this schedule shall not, for the purposes of this schedule, form part of any other constituency.

SECOND SCHEDULE.

Vide Clause 9, 1893.

IRISH MEMBERS IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Constituencies.	Number of Members for House of Commons	Constituencies.	Number of Members for House of Commons
Antrim county	Three	King's county	One
Armagh county	Two	Leitrim county	Two
Belfast borough (in divisions as mentioned below) ...	Four	Limerick county	Two
Carlow county	One	Limerick borough... ...	One
Cavan county	Two	Londonderry county ...	Two
Clare county...	Two	Londonderry borough ...	One
Cork county (in divisions as		Longford county	One
mentioned below)... ...	Five	Louth county	One
Cork borough	Two	Mayo county	Three
Donegal county	Three	Meath county	Two
Down county...	Three	Monaghan county... ...	Two
Dublin county	Two	Newry borough	One
Dublin borough (in divisions		Queen's county	One
as mentioned below) ...	Four	Roscommon county ...	Two
Fermanagh county	One	Sligo county	Two
Galway county	One	Tipperary county	Three
Galway borough	Three	Tyrone county	Three
Kerry county...	Three	Waterford county	One
Kildare county	One	Waterford borough ...	One
Kilkenny county	One	Westmeath county ...	One
Kilkenny borough	One	Wexford county	Two
		Wicklow county	One
			Eighty

(1) In this schedule the expression "borough" means an existing Parliamentary borough.

(2) In the Parliamentary boroughs of Belfast and Dublin, one member shall be returned by each of the existing Parliamentary divisions of those boroughs, and the law relating to the divisions of boroughs shall apply accordingly.

(3) The county of Cork shall be divided into two divisions, consisting of the East Riding and the West Riding, and three members shall be elected by the East Riding, and two members shall be elected by the West Riding; and the law relating to divisions of counties shall apply to those divisions.

THIRD SCHEDULE.

FINANCE.

IMPERIAL LIABILITIES, EXPENDITURE, AND MISCELLANEOUS REVENUE.

LIABILITIES.

For the purposes of this Act, "Imperial Liabilities" consist of—

(1) The funded and unfunded debt of the United Kingdom, inclusive of terminable annuities paid out of the permanent annual charge for the National Debt, and inclusive of the cost of the management of the said funded and unfunded debt, but exclusive of the Local Loans Stock and Guaranteed Land Stock and the cost of the management thereof; and Vide Clause 14 1886.

(2) All other charges on the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom for the repayment of borrowed money, or to fulfil a guarantee.

EXPENDITURE.

For the purpose of this Act Imperial expenditure consists of expenditure for the following services :—

Vide Clauses 10 to 19, 1893.

I. Naval and military expenditure (including Greenwich Hospital).
II. Civil expenditure, that is to say,—
(*a*) Civil List and Royal Family.
(*b*) Salaries, pensions, allowances, and incidental expenses of—
(i) Lord Lieutenant of Ireland;
(ii) Exchequer Judges in Ireland.
(*c*) Buildings, works, salaries, pensions, printing, stationery, allowances, and incidental expenses of—
(i) Parliament;
(ii) National Debt Commissioners;
(iii) Foreign Office and Diplomatic and Consular service, including secret service, special services, and telegraph subsidies;
(iv) Colonial Office, including special services and telegraph subsidies ;
(v) Privy Council;
(vi) Board of Trade, including the Mercantile Marine Fund, Patent Office, Railway Commission, and Wreck Commission, but excluding Bankruptcy;
(vii) Mint;
(viii) Meteorological Society;
(ix) Slave trade service.
(*d*) Foreign mails and telegraphic communication with places outside the United Kingdom.

REVENUE.

For the purposes of this Act the public revenue to a portion of which Ireland may claim to be entitled consists of revenue from the following sources :—

(1) Suez Canal shares or payments on account thereof.
(2) Loans and advances to foreign countries.
(3) Annual payments by British possessions.
(4) Fees, stamps, and extra receipts received by departments, the expenses of which are part of the Imperial expenditure.
(5) Small branches of the hereditary revenues of the Crown.
(6) Foreshores.

FOURTH SCHEDULE.

PROVISIONS AS TO POST OFFICE.

Vide Clause 20, 1893. (1) The Postmaster-General shall pay to the Irish Post Office in respect of any foreign mails sent through Ireland, and the Irish Post Office shall pay to the Postmaster-General in respect of any foreign mails sent through Great Britain, such sum as may be agreed upon for the carriage of those mails in Ireland or Great Britain as the case may be. Vide Clause 32, 1886.

(2) The Irish Post Office shall pay to the Postmaster-General :

(i) One half of the expense of the packet service and submarine telegraph lines between Great Britain and Ireland, after deducting from that expense the sum fixed by the Postmaster-General as incurred on account of foreign mails or telegraphic communication with a place out of the United Kingdom as the case may be : and

(ii) Five per cent. of the expenses of the conveyance outside the United Kingdom of foreign mails, and of the transmission of telegrams to places outside the United Kingdom : and

(iii) Such proportion of the receipts for telegrams to places out of the United Kingdom as is due in respect of the transmission outside the United Kingdom of such telegrams.

(3) The Postmaster-General and the Irish Post Office respectively shall pay to the other of them on account of foreign money orders, of compensation in respect of postal packets, and of any matters not specifically provided for in this Schedule such sums as may be agreed upon.

(4) Of the existing debt incurred in respect of telegraphs, a sum of five hundred and fifty thousand pounds Two-and-Three-Quarters per Cent. Consolidated Stock shall be treated as debt of the Irish Post Office, and for paying the dividends on and redeeming such stock there shall be paid half-yearly by the Irish Exchequer to the Exchequer of the United Kingdom an annuity of *eighteen thousand pounds for sixty years*, and such annuity when paid into the Exchequer shall be forthwith paid to the National Debt Commissioners and applied for the reduction of the National Debt.

(5) The Postmaster-General and the Irish Post Office may agree on the facilities to be afforded by the Irish Post Office in Ireland in relation to any matter the administration of which by virtue of this Act remains with the Postmaster-General, and with respect to the use of the Irish Telegraph lines for through lines in connexion with submarine telegraphs or with telegraphic communication with any place out of the United Kingdom.

FIFTH SCHEDULE.

REGULATIONS AS TO GRATUITIES AND PENSIONS FOR CIVIL SERVANTS.

SIXTH SCHEDULE.

PART I.

REGULATIONS AS TO ESTABLISHMENT OF POLICE FORCES AND AS TO THE ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY AND DUBLIN METROPOLITAN POLICE CEASING TO EXIST.

Vide Clause 30 1893.

(1) Such local police forces shall be established under such local authorities and for such counties, municipal boroughs, or other larger areas as may be provided by Irish Act.

Vide Clause 21, 1893.

(2) Whenever the Executive Committee of the Privy Council in Ireland certify to the Lord Lieutenant that a police force adequate for local purposes has been established in any area, then, subject to the provisions of this Act, he shall within six months thereafter direct the Royal Irish Constabulary to be withdrawn from the performance of regular police duties in such area, and such order shall be forthwith carried into effect.

(3) Upon any such withdrawal the Lord Lieutenant shall order measures to be taken for a proportionate reduction of the numbers of the Royal Irish Constabulary, and such order shall be duly executed.

(4) Upon the Executive Committee of the Privy Council in Ireland certifying to the Lord Lieutenant that adequate local police forces have been established in every part of Ireland, then, subject to the provisions of this Act, the Lord Lieutenant shall within six months after such certificate order measures to be taken for causing the whole of the Royal Irish Constabulary to cease to exist as a police force, and such order shall be duly executed.

(5) Where the area in which a local police force is established is part of the Dublin Metropolitan Police District, the foregoing regulations shall apply to the Dublin Metropolitan Police in like manner as if that force were the Royal Irish Constabulary.

PART II.

REGULATIONS AS TO GRATUITIES AND PENSIONS FOR THE ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY AND DUBLIN METROPOLITAN POLICE.

THE LEGISLATIVE BODIES.

1893.

SEVENTH SCHEDULE.

REGULATIONS AS TO HOUSES OF THE LEGISLATURE AND THE MEMBERS THEREOF.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Vide Clause 6, 18 3, and Clauses 9 & 10, 1892.

(1) There shall be a separate register of electors of councillors of the Legislative Council which shall be made, until otherwise provided by Irish Act, in like manner as the Parliamentary register of electors.

Vide Clause 6, 1893.

(2) Where, for the election of councillors any counties are combined so as to form one constituency, then until otherwise provided by Irish Act,

(*a*) the returning officer for the whole constitue cy shall be that one of the returning officers for Parliamentary elections for those counties to whom the writ is addressed, and the writ shall be addressed to the returning officer for the constituency with the largest population, according to the census of 1891.

(*b*) The returning officer shall have the same authority throughout the whole constituency as a returning officer at a Parliamentary election for a county has in the county.

(*c*) The registers of electors of each county shall jointly be the register of electors for the constituency.

(*d*) For the purposes of this schedule, "county" includes a county of a city or town, and this schedule and the law relating to the qualification of electors shall apply, as if the county of a city or town formed part of the county at large with which it is combined, and the qualification in the county of a city or town shall be the same as in such county at large.

(3) Writs shall be issued for the election of councillors at such time not less than one nor more than three months before the day for the periodical retirement of councillors as the Lord Lieutenant in Council may fix.

(4) The day for the periodical retirement of councillors shall until otherwise provided by Irish Act be the last day of August in every fourth year.

(5) For the purposes of such retirement, the constituencies shall be divided into two equal divisions, and the constituencies in each province shall be divided as nearly as may be equally between those divisions, and constituencies returning two or more members shall be treated as two or more constituencies, and placed in both divisions.

(6) Subject as aforesaid, the particular constituencies which are to be in each division shall be determined by lot.

(7) The said division and lot shall be made and conducted before the appointed day in manner directed by the Lord Lieutenant in Council.

(8) The first councillors elected for the constituencies in the first division shall retire on the first day of retirement which occurs after the first meeting of the

Irish Legislature, and the first Councillors for the constituencies in the second division shall retire on the second day of retirement after that meeting.

(9) Any casual vacancy among the councillors shall be filled by a new election, but the councillor filling the vacancy shall retire at the time at which the vacating councillor would have retired.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Vide Clause 7, 1893, and Clause 10, 1886.

(10) The Parliamentary register of electors for the time being shall, until otherwise provided by Irish Act, be the register of electors of the Legislative Assembly.

BOTH HOUSES.

Vide Clause 8, 1893.

(11) Until otherwise provided by Irish Act, the Lord Lieutenant in Council may make regulations for adapting the existing election laws to the election of members of the two Houses of the Legislature.

Vide Clause 7, 1886.

(12) Annual sessions of the Legislature shall be held.

(13) Any peer, whether of the United Kingdom, Great Britain, England, Scotland, or Ireland, shall be qualified to be a member of either House.

Vide Clauses 21 & 24, 1886.

(14) A member of either House may by writing under his hand resign his seat, and the same shall thereupon be vacant.

(15) The same person shall not be a member of both Houses.

(16) Until otherwise provided by Irish Act, if the same person is elected to a seat in each House, he shall, before the eighth day after the next sitting of either House, by written notice, elect in which House he will serve, and upon such election his seat in the other House shall be vacant, and if he does not so elect, his seat in both Houses shall be vacant.

(17) Until otherwise provided by Irish Act, any such notice electing in which House a person will sit, or any notice of resignation, shall be given in manner directed by the Standing Orders of the Houses, and if there is no such direction, shall be given to the Lord Lieutenant.

(18) The powers of either House shall not be affected by any vacancy therein, or any defect in the election or qualification of any member thereof.

(19) Until otherwise provided by Irish Act, the holders of such Irish offices as may be named by Order of the Queen in Council before the appointed day shall be entitled to be elected to and sit in either House notwithstanding that they hold offices under the Crown, but on acceptance of any such office the seat of any such person in either House shall be vacated unless he has accepted the office in succession to some other of the said offices.

TRANSITORY.

(20) The Lord Lieutenant in Council may, before the appointed day, make regulations for the following purposes :—

(*a*) The making of a register of electors of councillors in time for the election of the first councillors, and with that object for the variation of the days relating to registration in the existing election laws, and for prescribing the duties of officers, and for making such adaptations of those laws as appear necessary or proper for duly making a register ;

(*b*) The summoning of the two Houses of the Legislature of Ireland, the issue of writs and any other things appearing to be necessary or proper for the election of members of the two Houses ;

(*c*) The election of a Chairman (whether called Speaker, President, or by any other name) of each House, the quorum of each House, the communications

between the two Houses, and such adaptation to the proceedings of the two Houses of the procedure of Parliament, as appears expedient for facilitating the conduct of business by those Houses on their first meeting;

(*d*) The adaptation to the two houses and the members thereof of any laws and customs relating to the House of Commons or the members thereof;

(*e*) The deliberation and voting together of the two Houses in cases provided by this Act.

(21) The regulations may be altered by Irish Act, and also in so far as they concern the procedure of either House alone, by Standing Orders of that House, but shall, until altered, have effect as if enacted in this Act.

THE SCHEDULES OF 1886.

In the Bill of 1886, there were no details whatever given in the proposed Schedules, and consequently no comparison can be made between them and the Schedules in the Bill of 1893. The following skeleton was all that appeared in the 1886 Bill:—

FIRST SCHEDULE.

FIRST ORDER OF THE IRISH LEGISLATIVE BODY.

Electoral Districts.	Number of Members.	Rotation.

SECOND SCHEDULE.

PROVISIONS RELATING TO THE FIRST ORDER OF THE IRISH LEGISLATIVE BODY.

THIRD SCHEDULE.

BOUNDARIES OF DIVISIONS OF THE CITY OF CORK FOR THE PURPOSE OF RETURNING MEMBERS TO THE SECOND ORDER OF THE LEGISLATIVE BODY.

FOURTH SCHEDULE.

PROVISIONS AS TO SUPERANNUATION ALLOWANCES OF PERSONS IN THE PERMANENT CIVIL SERVICE.

FIFTH SCHEDULE.

TRANSITORY PROVISIONS.

APPENDICES.

Appendix I.

PROMISE *v.* PERFORMANCE.

The Radical Party are again trying their old tactics of 1880 and 1885. Before the Election of 1880 Mr. Gladstone and his friends deluged the country, especially the agricultural constituencies, with promises of every kind. The Electors rashly trusted these promises, and Mr. Gladstone came into power with the enormous majority of 120.

Mr. Gladstone was in office for over five years, from April, 1880, to July, 1885, with this great majority.

What did he do in the way of social reform or material benefit for the labouring classes during that period? Nothing worth counting. The working classes were wholly neglected.

The country was involved in many needless and dishonourable wars abroad, and in heavy and fruitless expenditure. The Radical party caused a war in Egypt, four bloody and useless campaigns in the Soudan, the waste of millions of money, and the betrayal of General Gordon. The Radical Party also caused the disastrous and disgraceful war and surrender in the Transvaal; the evacuation of Kandahar, and the panic expenditure of over £6,000,000 in consequence of the Russian advance towards India. Mr. Gladstone's special war expenditure amounted to nearly £20,000,000. Under the Radical Government, from 1880 to '85, there was 14,000 outrages in Ireland, and terrorism and misery.

These were the leading results of Mr. Gladstone's policy.

Again, before the Election of 1885, Mr. Gladstone and his friends lavished promises upon the Electors. Every benefit, from three acres and cow upwards, was promised by them. For the second time many of the agricultural labourers trusted Mr. Gladstone, and he came into power in January, 1886, with a majority of 84.

What did he then do for the working men of England, Scotland and Wales?

Absolutely nothing! In order to please Mr. Parnell and eighty-five disloyal Irish Nationalists, the Gladstonians abandoned the interests of the English working men, broke all their

pledges, and went off on a wild goose chase after "Home Rule" and a separate Parliament for Ireland. The only result of this policy, if carried out, would have been to break up the United Kingdom, to disrupt the Empire, and to bring thousands of ruined and desperate Irishmen over to England to compete in our overstocked labour markets.

Fortunately for the nation, the good sense of the English people, in July, 1886, saved the country and the Empire from so terrible a calamity. By a majority of nearly three to one the English Electors in 1886 rejected Mr. Gladstone's wild proposals and placed Lord Salisbury, as leader of the Conservative and Unionist party, in office.

What have the Conservative and Unionist Government done for the people, especially for the working men? For the Agricultural labourer they have passed two Allotment Acts, so that every labourer may have an allotment on fair and easy terms. Since the Conservative Government came into power the number of allotments has increased by nearly 130,000.

The Conservative Government have passed Acts for the better Housing of the Working Classes, to enable every labouring family to have a comfortable and healthy home.

The Conservative Government have established a department of Agriculture, so that the greatest of British industries can be fostered and benefited. The Conservative Government have lowered the taxation on tea (£1,500,000), on tobacco (£600,000), on currants (£210,000), and on small houses (£540,000).

The Conservative Government have provided £2,500,000 a year to establish Free Education, so that every child can now obtain knowledge without fee or cost. This means to a working man, who had formerly to pay, say 2d. each for six children, a saving of 1s. a week.

The Conservative Government have also passed a great Mines Act, to promote the safety and comfort of the Miners; a Merchandise Marks Act, to keep out of our country falsely-marked Foreign Articles that used to undersell our home-made products; a Railway Rates Act to prevent the excessive charges of the Railway Companies and the favour formerly shown to Foreign products; a Local Government Act, which gives every ratepayer a share in the Government of his country, and Technical Education Acts, which have provided means for industrial instruction for the working classes throughout the country.

The Conservative Government have ensured the saving of nearly £3,000,000 a year to the taxpayers, or a practical reduction of the National Debt of £100,000,000, by reducing the

interest on the National Debt. They have greatly strengthened, in spite of Gladstonian opposition, the Navy of England, which is essential to protect the liberties, our world-wide commerce, and the food supplies of the people.

The Conservative Government have preserved the peace of the world; lowered the National Expenditure; and opened up fresh countries and Markets for British trade and British Colonists in India, in Eastern and Southern Africa.

Since Lord Salisbury took office in 1886, the trade of the United Kingdom—and trade is the life-blood of our people—has increased by 126,000,000.

They have restored security, peace and prosperity to Ireland.

The above is a record of some of the practical, solid, undeniable benefits conferred by the Conservative and Unionist Government upon their countrymen.

For the third time within twelve years Mr. Gladstone and his friends are now trying to beguile the Electors with specious promises and pledges, which they never intend to perform.

Let the Electors remember how they were tricked and sold by the Gladstonian party in 1880 and 1885.

Let them compare the solid performance of the Conservative Government with the empty words and broken promises of the Radicals, and trust the party of deeds rather than the party of words.—[N.U., No. 3.]

Appendix II.

IMPORTANT POINTS IN IRISH HISTORY.

The following brief narrative of Irish history is taken from Mr. Patton's "Speaker's Handbook on the Irish Question":—

THE KINGDOM OF IRELAND.

In 1170, in the reign of Henry II., certain English barons undertook to conquer Ireland. They found there five kingdoms, but no one Celtic State called Ireland, Hibernia, Erin, or anything else. Ireland was not a kingdom till England made her one. *It is often said that England has oppressed Ireland for* 700 *years*, but from 1170 until at least 1600 England did not own or interfere with three-fourths of Ireland. From 1170 for many centuries Ireland was practically divided into two parts—one inhabited by English colonists, and the other, which was much larger, by tribes who had no central or settled government. Henry VIII. constituted Ireland a Kingdom.

IRELAND AND CIVILISATION.

Ireland had been the seat of an ancient civilisation. Many men of considerable learning, culture, and piety inhabited her monasteries in very early times. Long before a single Englishman ever planted foot in Ireland, that civilisation died

utterly. It is as well to recollect that everything of law, politics, and freedom Ireland possesses, has come to her from without—from England.

THE EARLY POPULATION OF IRELAND.

As has been already pointed out, there is reason to believe the majority of the people of Ireland to be of Anglo-Saxon descent. This, however, is of course only true now; it could not be true of the days before the English entered Ireland. Sir John Davies, however, who was Attorney-General of Ireland in the time of James I., emphatically tells us it was so then; and Mr. Gladstone, at Liverpool, in June, 1886, quoted his words with approval. But it is a *fatal and popular blunder to imagine that even before the arrival of the English there was a Celtic State in Ireland.* The Danes had settled already on the east, and the Spaniards on the west. So little was Ireland the country of the Celtic Irish that hardly a single town of importance in Ireland had a Celtic origin. The Danes built Dublin, Drogheda, Wexford and Waterford; the Normans built Cork and Limerick; the Spaniards built Galway; while Derry and Belfast are the creation of English and Scotch settlers.

THE ENGLISH PALE.

The part of Ireland inhabited by the first settlers was called the English Pale. In the days of John this "Pale" was far less than half the country. In Ulster, Connaught, and the non-maritime parts of Munster and Leinster, the Irish were left unmolested. In the reign of Richard II. this "Pale" consisted of only four counties—Dublin, Meath, Kildare, and Louth—or less than one-tenth of Ireland, the other nine-tenths being in the hands of the non-English population.

HOME RULE NONSENSE ABOUT INVADERS.

A great deal of nonsense is often talked about the English settlers in Ireland being invaders and interlopers. Of course they were, but that does not afford any reason whatever for clearing their descendants out of the country. The Celtic Irish themselves were once interlopers, who so treated their predecessors in occupation that hardly any trace of them is to be found. Besides, if this is to be the rule, why confine it to Ireland? On such a theory the English should not only retire from Ireland, but from England, which they once took from the ancient Britons, whose descendants are still living in Wales. The entire white people, both English and Irish who live in the United States ought, on that principle, to send all American negroes back to Africa, and come to Europe themselves, so as to leave America to the Red Indians, to whom it once undoubtedly belonged.

THE OLD IRISH PARLIAMENT.

The old Irish Parliament was, in its origin, simply a Parliament of the English settlers in Ireland. It had no connection whatever in early days with the non-English population. The Statute of Kilkenny will illustrate this conclusively; it was passed by the so-called "Irish" Parliament in 1367, and under it English subjects in Ireland were forbidden to intermarry with the native Irish under the penalties of High Treason. It is interesting to recollect that in 1376, Edward III. summoned the Irish clergy and laity (*i.e.*, the English clergy and laity in Ireland, whom we shall henceforth call the ANGLO-IRISH), to send deputies to the Parliament at Westminster, which they did.

POYNINGS' LAW.

To understand Poynings' Law, which is almost always spoken of now as a piece of English oppression, it must be remembered that early in the reign of Henry VII. the impostor Lambert Simnel appeared. He was crowned king in Christ Church Cathedral, Dublin, and he forthwith convened a Parliament which wreaked vengeance on all his opponents. It was a Parliament of certain Anglo-Irish and others who followed him, and it proceeded to punish those who remained loyal to

Henry. When Simnel was crushed, the Act called Poynings' Law, from the Deputy (or Lord-Lieutenant) of the day, was passed. It provided "that Parliaments should not be holden in Ireland until the King's Lieutenant and council had notified to the King, under the Great Seal of that land, the causes and considerations, and all such Acts as to them seemeth should pass in the same Parliament; nor until such causes, and acts, and considerations had been affirmed by the King or his council to be good and expedient, or license to summon Parliament had been given under the Great Seal of England." It was passed, not to enslave the native Irish, *with whom it had nothing to do*, but at the request of the Anglo-Irish, to protect them from such a Lord-Deputy as had been the Earl of Kildare, who had connived at Simnel's coronation. The little English colony begged for the Act, in order that no laws might in future be passed by a Viceroy without the knowledge of the Sovereign. Hence the consent of the English Privy Council was for long regarded as necessary to measures passed by the Anglo-Irish.

IRELAND UNDER ELIZABETH.

Ireland would, perhaps, never have been reduced by English troops but for the Pope and Philip II. of Spain. In 1579 they despatched a force to Ireland to strike at Elizabeth. The Earl of Desmond joined them, carrying with him the native Irish. They were, however, utterly routed by Lord Grey de Wilton, Desmond's estates were forfeited, and a Parliament sitting in Dublin, allotted them to English settlers. These settlers were called "Undertakers," because they undertook to reside on the lands. In 1593 fresh troubles arose, this time in the North, when Hugh O'Neil, Earl of Tyrone, demanded the expulsion of all English settlers and officials, and looked for aid to Spain. He roused the Native Irish, with whom many of the earlier settlers joined, the rebellion became widespread, and Elizabeth's "Undertakers" had to fly. In 1601 the Spaniards arrived, but Lord Mountjoy completely defeated them, and reduced the whole country. The year 1603, the same that witnessed the Union of the Crowns of England and Scotland, saw the first conquest of all Ireland.

THE REFORMATION IN IRELAND.

It is possible—and, indeed, likely—that but for religion there would not now be an Irish Question. Conquerors and conquered have existed at all times and in all countries, and, save where some powerful disintegrating element was at work, such as a religious difference, they have usually coalesced. The Reformation, however, brought a new quarrel into Ireland. The earlier English settlers remained Roman Catholic, and amalgamated easily with the native Irish, becoming, in the language of the old proverb, "More Irish than the Irish themselves;" but the later settlers, being Protestants, never so amalgamated. The old quarrel was superseded by another.

THE PLANTATION OF ULSTER.

This was the most memorable feature of the reign of James I. On the death of Elizabeth much opposition was shown to James, and especially in Ulster. Accordingly, to check rebellion, the lands of certain northern counties were taken by the Crown, and three-quarters of a million of acres were granted on favourable terms to settlers. The citizens of London received large grants in the county of Derry, and made Derry city—henceforth Londonderry—the leading town of the extreme north. Protestant colonists from Scotland and England were encouraged to settle in 1611, and again on a large scale in 1615.

STRAFFORD IN IRELAND.

With the English politics of the Earl of Strafford we have nothing to do, but he undoubtedly benefited Ireland. He increased the revenues, improved trade, and administered justice; most important of all, he mainly founded the Ulster linen trade, bringing over flax seed from Holland, and encouraging Flemish workmen. His action towards the woollen trade was not equally beneficent. Like all other Englishmen of the period, he thought he saw in it a rival to English trade.

The woollen trade had, however, been entirely created by the Protestant settlers. It is they, and not the native Irish, who were injured by its suppression.

THE GREAT REBELLION OF 1641.

When the strong hand of Strafford was removed, rebellion appeared. To a large extent it was a war of religion, for religion had consolidated the native Irish. On all sides they rose against the settlers, whose extermination seemed certain, as Charles I., then in difficulties with his Parliament, could give them no succour. Men, women, and children perished in terrible massacres, which were not paralleled in English history until the Indian Mutiny.

OLIVER CROMWELL.

Cromwell crushed this rebellion. The Irish had inflicted fearful cruelties on the settlers, and Cromwell now punished them with fearful cruelty. Yet in one respect it was a merciful policy, for his unsparing severity at Drogheda and Wexford at once caused all opposition to subside. But Cromwell's legislative arrangements were even more important than his campaign. He at once saw that *a Legislative Union was a necessity to the peace of Ireland, so he provided that the Anglo-Irish should send thirty representatives to Westminster.* In Cromwell's view the entire Irish difficulty was religious, so he resolved to drive the Roman Catholics back to Connaught and to Clare. The broad stream of the Shannon was to be the border. Thousands of them went abroad, and we subsequently find their names in the record of foreign military service. Cromwell planted their confiscated lands with settlers drawn from every class and creed in Great Britain. Tipperary, for example, was peopled by his soldiers; and the Joyce country in Galway takes its name from the family of one of Cromwell's troopers. When Cromwell died, more than half the population of Ireland must have been Anglo-Saxon by descent. It was, indeed, so in the reign of James I., according to Sir John Davies, before a single Cromwellian could have settled in the country.

IRELAND UNDER CHARLES II.

Charles II. modified the Cromwellian policy by an Act of Settlement passed in 1661 by a Dublin Parliament. This body restored their lands to all former owners who had not taken part in the rebellion and massacres of 1641; yet more than two-thirds of the land remained in the hands of the Protestant minority, who were probably not more than one-fifth of the population. Worse still was the fact that the Roman Catholics were exiled from all share in the government of their native land. It is, indeed, absolutely true that the majority of the Irish people, whether of Celtic or Anglo-Saxon race, had to submit to a tyranny from the minority, on whom the sole restraining influence was the Imperial Government.

IRELAND UNDER JAMES II.

James II. proceeded to reverse all this. His object, unfortunately, was not to preserve an equal balance between the two communities, but to make the Roman Catholics supreme in Ireland as in England. In 1687 he made the Earl of Tyrconnel Viceroy, and the work began. The Protestant militia was deprived of muskets. All judges and sheriffs were selected from the Roman Catholics. Fear seized the settlers, who were threatened at once with loss of life, liberty, and land. At first they retreated before a great popular Roman Catholic outbreak, but at the walls of Derry they rallied and triumphed in the greatest siege of history. "The "aim of the popular movement was," writes Mr. J. R. Green, "the ruin of the "English settlers. The Act of Settlement, on which all property rested was at once "repealed." *Three thousand Protestants of name and fortune were massed together in the highest Bill of Attainder the world has ever seen. Seventy-three peers and nearly all the Commons were condemned to death without any trial, simply because they were Protestants.* Eighty-five knights and baronets, 83 clergymen, 22 ladies, and 2,182 esquires were condemned to be butchered by the Roman Catholic Parliament of James II.

THE PENAL LAWS.

It was little wonder, then, that the Protestant Parliament of William III. took good care to protect itself. It adopted two measures:—First, the Penal Laws; and secondly, it petitioned for a Union. Under the Penal Laws the Roman Catholics of Ireland were rigorously excluded, not only from all share in the government of their native land, but from its most important liberties. Writing of the two hostile camps in Ireland, Edmund Burke at a later day said: "One of these bodies was to possess *all* the franchises, *all* the property, *all* the education; the other was to be composed of hewers of wood and cutters of turf for them." This code was absolutely in itself indefensible, but four things must always be remembered about it:—

1. It was passed, not by a Westminster, but by a Dublin Parliament.
2. In the Parliaments that passed the Penal Laws there was scarcely a single member whose sufferings at the hands of the other side were not incomparably greater than those he now proposed to inflict.
3. The Irish Penal Laws had their counterpart in England itself, and were chiefly copied from the laws in force against Protestants in Roman Catholic countries.
4. As soon as the terror caused by the Bill of Attainder had died away, the Penal Laws died also; and though remaining in the Statute Book were not, save to a very small extent put in force.

ROMAN CATHOLIC DISABILITIES.

Neither must it be forgotten that the position of Irish Roman Catholics has been grossly misrepresented and their disabilities exaggerated. The favourite Separatist trick on this, as on all historical points, is to judge every Irish episode *as if its parallel was not to be found outside Ireland itself.* Thus a recent Home Rule pamphlet begins with the wrongs Ireland suffered from King John as if England did not suffer the same, or worse. As a matter of fact, an *Irish Roman Catholic was in a far better position from* 1793 *to* 1832 *than his English or Scotch co-religionist.* In the latter countries he was excluded from the franchise and from office. *In Ireland he had the franchise, and was admissible to most civil and military places of trust.* For Irish, though not for English or Scotch Roman Catholics, the Test and Corporation Acts had been repealed. In England less than eighty years ago a Roman Catholic could not take a university degree, or become a member of a corporation, or rise in the Army or Navy above the rank of a lieutenant. In Ireland there were no such prohibitions. *In no country in the world where there was an established religion did the Nonconformist enjoy the privileges of the Irish Roman Catholic.* Even an English Presbyterian, though a member of a Church established by law in Scotland, had, in order to qualify for any English office, to take the sacrament according to the rites of the Church of England! But nowadays everything contrary to modern ideas and enlightenment which was done in Ireland in the past is proclaimed to be an Irish grievance: as if all other countries enjoyed free and upright government, or as if the history of every state in the world was not stained, even within the past century, with episodes of wrong.

IRELAND FROM 1700 TO 1782.

The history of Ireland during the earlier part of the eighteenth century tells us of a desire for a Legislative Union. In 1707 the Dublin Parliament prayed for it, but Queen Anne and her Ministers foolishly closed their ears. They had just in that year assented to a union with Scotland, because they thought a Parliament in that country *co-ordinate* with the English Parliament was dangerous; while they thought, as other people have since done, that a *subordinate* Parliament in Dublin could do no harm. Both parties in Ireland wanted a union urgently—the Protestants for security, the Roman Catholics to get rid of the Penal Laws.

GRATTAN'S PARLIAMENT.

By 1782 a different state of feeling had grown up among the Protestants. In 1775 the North American States had secured their independence, and this was not without effect on Ireland. Poynings' Law had become a source of offence, as had a statute known as the 6th of George I., by which the English Parliament claimed the right to legislate for Ireland. The Parliament of Anglo-Irish in Dublin, led by Grattan and Flood, demanded independence. Ireland, it was for the first time insisted, had a right to a separate national existence, united to England only by the link of the Crown. The English Ministry yielded, and for the first time in history an absolutely independent Anglo-Irish Parliament sat. It was, of course, exclusively a Protestant Parliament; but one of its earliest measures was to give Roman Catholics the right to buy freehold land, to teach in schools, and to educate their children. The following facts about Grattan's Parliament (as it is often now called) must be carefully remembered :—

1. It was a legislative assembly without a corresponding Executive. The Irish Parliament could not turn the Irish Government out of office.
2. It could, however, at any time have paralysed Great Britain, by refusing to join in any war in which the latter was engaged, or by refusing supplies.
3. It could have (as was actually proposed) put prohibitive duties on British commerce, and provoked a war of tariffs.
4. It quarrelled directly with the British Parliament on the question of the Regency Bill; and a disastrous split was only prevented by the convalescence of George III. In this matter it acted in absolute contravention of the laws regulating the connection between the two countries, which were only "paper guarantees."
5. It admitted Roman Catholics to the Franchise, but refused, by 170 to 30, to admit them to Parliament or public offices.
6. It passed in 18 years no less than 54 Coercion Acts, or three *per annum*.
7. Under this Parliament Ireland was, as we shall see later on, reduced to beggary.
8. Matters culminated in the rebellion of 1798, which had its share in intensifying in Ireland the feelings between Protestant and Catholic. It quickly, as of old, became a religious war, and had its share in inducing Pitt to introduce his measure for a Legislative Union.

IMPERIAL GOVERNMENT SINCE THE UNION.

How the United Parliament has governed Ireland since 1800 will be apparent to all who read of the Land Legislation past in the last 20 years (*see* Part II.). The following list of measures passed since the Act of Union should prove useful :—

1829. Roman Catholic Emancipation.
1831. National system of Education, under which every child can be educated at the expense of the State.
1835. Roman Catholic priests allowed to celebrate marriage.
1838. Tenants relieved of tithes by Tithes Commutation Act.
1840. Municipal Reform Act.
1842. Poor Relief Act.
1845. Queen's Colleges (open to all sects) established.
1847. £10,000,000 spent. Relief works for potato famine.
1849. Incumbered Estates Act—facilities for purchase.
1858. Abolition of property qualification for M.P.'s.

1867. Religious Disabilities Act. Lord Chancellor may be a Roman Catholic.
1868. Reform Act.
1869. Disestablishment of Irish Church.
1870. Landlord and Tenant Act. (Compensation for Improvements, etc.)
1878. Intermediate Education Act—for endowing schools.
1879. Royal University established.
1881. Land Law Act (Fair Rent, Free Sale, Fixity of Tenure.)
1882. Arrears Act.
1883. Light Railways Act.
1885. Land Purchase Act. (Ashbourne Act.)
1885. Reform Act. (Extended franchise to householders.)
1887. Land Act—130,000 Leaseholders benefited.
1888. Renewal of Ashbourne Act.
1889. Light Railways Act.
1891. Great Land Purchase Act.
1892. Irish Local Government Bill introduced, but obstructed by Gladstone party.

In may be mentioned, in addition, that £38,000,000 of public money has been advanced to Ireland for public works, and of which £7,000,000 has been absolutely forgiven.

Appendix III.

THE QUESTION OF ULSTER.

A speaker in Great Britain often found himself confronted before the last General Election by a well-known Home Rule argument. It will be said, "Oh, Ulster joins with the rest of Ireland in asking for Home Rule. There were 17 Nationalist members from Ulster, and only 16 Unionist members." Since the election of August, 1892, the members are 19 Unionists to 14 Nationalists.

To this argument there are two answers. The first is this: that the majority was apparent and not real. The second, which is absolutely conclusive, relates to the past history of the Ulster Plantation.

1. The Nationalist majority in Ulster would never have existed at all, only for an anomalous distribution of the seats in Ulster. In that province there are 33 electoral divisions, each returning one member, while the average number of voters is 8,000 per constituency. Two small boroughs, Londonderry and Newry, possessing only 3,800 and 2,100 voters respectively, were, however, allowed to exist and give the Nationalists their majority. Londonderry now returns a Unionist. The important fact, however, is that at the General Election of 1886, 72,704 *electors in Ulster voted for Home Rule and* 88,865 *against it.* This by itself pointed to a grossly faulty condition of the representation. In July, 1893, the members were: Unionists, 127,464; Nationalists, 111,109; and there were 19 Unionist members as against 14 Nationalists.

2. There is, however, a still stronger line of argument. *The second community in Ireland,* as we have called the great Unionist body of North-East Ulster, has a separate historical origin. *It owes its existence to the Scotch and English colonies,* founded for high imperial considerations, *in North-East Ulster.* The men who form it are the sons and descendants of the original colonists and within the limits of the original colonies they are in an overwhelming majority. Donegal, save in the barony of Raphoe, was never a "planted" county, nor were Cavan and Monaghan thoroughly and entirely colonised. *When these counties are subtracted, the area of the real Plantation is found.* The real strength of the Unionist position lies not in the Ulster of the geographer, but in the *Ulster of the historian—that is, in this "Plantation."* Within this, its own legitimate sphere, Unionist opinion is easily supreme. The following figures demonstrate it:

CONSTITUENCIES AND MEMBERS.

	No. of Constituencies.	Home Rulers.		Unionists.	
		1886.	1892.	1886.	1892.
Ulster ...	33	17	14	16	19
Plantation...	26	10*	7	16	19

VOTES GIVEN AT 1886 ELECTION.

	For Home Rule.	Unionist.	Unionist Majority.
Ulster	72,704	88,865	16,161
Plantation	51,188	80,947	29,759

Hence, then, arises the Unionist appeal to the honesty of the electorate. The contention is as follows:—Home Rule need not be granted in deference to any supposed national rights, or in deference to the wishes of the majority of the inhabitants of Ireland. But if we cannot convince you of that, if you still think you must yield to one Irish community, you are also bound to yield to the other, and leave it free, (1) either to join a Dublin Parliament, (2) to continue its representation at Westminster, or (3) to have its own government.

Appendix IV.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE IRISH MAJORITY AND MINORITY.

There is another line of argument fairly open to Unionist speakers. It is that which points to the constitution of the Irish majority, and, if it does nothing else, it helps to point to the

* Including Londonderry and Newry.

existence of two communities. The following facts may be borne in mind :—

1. At the General Election of 1886 exactly half the Irish electorate voted for Home Rule, but no more. The other half voted against it or abstained. The proportion that voted for Home Rule in 1892 was only a little over two-fifths—the numbers being 308,950 Parnellite and anti-Parnellite voters, out of 744,816 electors. The Conservative or Unionist voters numbered 82,124.

2. The names of all the principal commercial men in Ireland are conspicuous by their absence from every list of Home Rulers that has ever seen the light. The Nationalist leaders are followed neither by bankers, brewers, millers, timber merchants, linen merchants, cloth merchants, stockbrokers, shipbuilders, engineers, monster shopkeepers, booksellers, or hotel-keepers. A few solitary names alone can be found from such quarters.

3. The only working-men in Ireland who correspond at all in their habits and methods of life and employment to those in English and Scotch industrial centres are overwhelmingly against Home Rule. The city of Belfast has its electorate almost entirely composed of such working-men, and its vote at the election of July, 1886, was as follows—for Home Rule, 6,460; against, 17,861. Majority against, 11,401. In the election of 1892 only one seat was contested. Mr. Sexton was beaten by Mr. Arnold Foster in West Belfast by 839, the numbers being 4,316 against 3,427. The other three divisions returned Unionists unopposed.

4. The vast majority of the educated classes are against Home Rule, while the Nationalists are supported by thousands of voters who can neither read nor write. To such an extent is this the case that out of every 6 electors in Ireland, one is unable to mark his cross on a balloting paper. At the General Election of 1886, out of 194,994 voters 36,722 were illiterate. At the General Election of 1892 no less than 84,919 Irish electors out of 395,024 voters voted illiterate, that is 21·5 per cent. of the total Irish voters. In England and Wales, on the contrary, out of 2,416,272 voters, in 1886 there were only 38,587 illiterates, or only one voter in 62. In July, 1892, there were 46,109 out of 3,725,972 voters, that is only 1·24 per cent. Wherever there are many illiterates, there is a Nationalist Member returned by an overwhelming majority. Thus the one-fourth of the County Donegal, which

returns Mr. Swift MacNeill, M.P., has as many of these poor ignorant voters as the whole kingdom of Scotland. The three Unionist members for Belfast, representing 23,000 voters, had only 1,500 illiterates in their divisions; but the fourth member, up to 1892 a Nationalist, Mr. Sexton, M.P., represented 8,600 voters, of whom 1,852 were illiterate.

5. There were in 1886 1.173,600 Protestants in Ireland; but there are not 5,000 Protestant Home Rulers, including women, infants, and lunatics.
6. The Church of Ireland (Protestant Episcopal), numbering in 1886, 639,500 members, and its General Synod, unanimously declared against Home Rule.
7. The Presbyterian Church in Ireland, numbering 470,700, with equal unanimity declared against Home Rule.
8. The governing bodies of the Methodist, Baptist, and Non-subscribing Presbyterians also with practical unanimity protested against Home Rule.*
9. The members of the Chambers of Commerce in both Belfast and Dublin have also protested; as have the members of the Board and Senate of the University of Dublin.

These considerations will, at least, appeal to the minds of those who hold that majorities should be weighed as well as counted.

Appendix V.

WHY AND HOW THE ACT OF UNION WAS PASSED.

THE IRISH PEOPLE WERE CHEATED OF THEIR NATIONAL RIGHTS THROUGH THE PASSING OF THE ACT OF UNION IN 1800!

This argument is one which weighs powerfully with a certain class of individuals. It is as well to state at once that the entire

* The presentation in November, 1888, of an address to Lords Salisbury and Hartington showed that out of 990 non-Episcopal ministers in Ireland only 8 were Home Rulers. It may also be pointed out that the Protestant community in Ireland is sometimes assumed to be "Orange," but it includes 100,000 adult Liberals, while the members of the Orange Society number less than 50,000. On the other hand, the Protestant Home Rulers are so few that they are unable to hold public meetings without the assistance of a Roman Catholic audience.

contention depends upon two gross and palpable fictions, which have no historical basis whatever. These fictions are—

1. That the Act of Union was carried in violation of the wishes of the Irish people; and

2. That the Act of Union was carried by means of bribery and corruption.

These absurd fallacies must be dealt with separately.

FIRST FICTION.—"AGAINST THE CONSENT OF THE IRISH PEOPLE."

No more impudent perversion of the truth than this can be imagined. In 1800 the enormous majority of the inhabitants of Ireland were in favour of the Act of Union. The entire opposition to the measure came from some of the Protestants, who in all only numbered 800,000 out of 5,000,000. This can be easily understood; Grattan's Parliament was a Protestant institution by origin and history. On the other hand, almost

THE ENTIRE ROMAN CATHOLIC POPULATION WAS IN FAVOUR OF THE ACT OF UNION.

Proof. Nothing will illustrate this plain historical fact better than the conduct of the Roman Catholic prelates. All the Archbishops—Dublin, Armagh, Cashel, and Tuam—were, *with their clergy*, in favour of the Union. The entire body of the bishops *unanimously* took the same side, taking with them *their* clergy and the enormously preponderating voice of the laity. Plowden, a Roman Catholic writer, tells us distinctly that this was so, and a glance at the contemporary press will set at rest the doubts of the most suspicious. Practically unanimous petitions went up from the towns of the Catholic West and South. The Roman Catholics of Waterford, of Cork, of Wexford, of Tipperary, of Cahir, of Kilkenny, of Monasterevan, of Longford, of Dundalk, of New Ross, of Limerick, of Roscommon, of Leitrim, and of other places too numerous to name, petitioned for the Union.

This fact would, perhaps, not be doubted but for an absurd statement made by the younger Grattan, and perpetually quoted by Home Rulers—among others, by Mr. Swift McNeill, M.P. The younger Grattan wrote as follows:—"Only 7,000 persons petitioned in favour of the Union, and 110,000 freeholders and 707,000 persons signed petitions against the measure." It is a piece of good fortune that these numbers bear their own absurdity on their face. We shall take two of his numbers. First, there were 74 petitions at least, in favour of the Union, and *four of them alone*—those from Wexford City and the counties of Leitrim, Tyrone, and Roscommon—were signed by 9,330 persons. So the younger Grattan's statement as to those for the Union is simply false. Now for his 707,000 persons who signed against it. In all Ireland in 1800, had the country been unanimous, there were not enough persons. The total population was only 5,000,000. Of these, about half would be children and young persons; that leaves 2,500,000, adults. Of these, half would be women, and there never has been any pretence that they signed; that leaves 1,259,000. Of these 250,000 would be Protestants, the remaining 1,000,000 Roman Catholics. Now in 1800 not nearly 50 per cent. of the Protestants could write, nor nearly 15 per cent. of the Roman Catholics. That would give us, in case all Ireland were unanimous, not more than 275,000 possible signatures against the Union; while we know for a fact that the Roman Catholic laity were, with their clergy for it.* Of similar materials are dozens of Home Rule versions of history constructed.

There is, however, an additional fact which settles all controversy beyond yea or nay. The Irish constituencies were either borough or county. The boroughs were indeed *close*, being generally owned by some patron who sent his nominee to Parliament; but the counties were absolutely *free*. Before 1793 only Protestants

* It may be urged that illiterates signed by making their marks. This can hardly be maintained in view of the fact that the bishops and clergy signed on behalf of their flocks *for the Act of Union*; or in face of the well-known fact that illiterate Irish voters almost invariably vote with their priests. In any case the *facts* about the petitions from the West and South are ample.

had the power of voting. In that year the Roman Catholics got the franchise, and this in such a liberal measure that in the counties of the South and West they largely outnumbered the Protestants. For example, when the franchise was Protestant, Cork county had 3,000 voters; when it was open to Roman Catholics there were 20,000. Before 1793, Galway county had 700 voters; after it, 4,000. It was the Roman Catholics of Ireland who elected the members who sat in the Irish Parliament for Clare, Cork, Kerry, Limerick, Tipperary, and Waterford (that is, for all the counties of Munster); also for Mayo, Galway, Longford, Westmeath, Wexford, and other counties. In 1800 the members for the counties we have named (and we have omitted others where the Protestants might possibly have polled a majority of voters) *voted for the Act of Union*. In 1801 they went to their Roman Catholic constituents to get elected to the United Parliament, and by these Roman Catholic constituents they were ALL re-elected.

SECOND FICTION.—BRIBERY AND CORRUPTION.

Of a similar kind is the talk one hears about bribery and corruption. This accusation is not made, like the last, by inventing falsehoods, but by suppressing facts. It is quite true, that £1,260,000 was spent to pass the Act of Union. It is quite true that in those days there existed both in Ireland and England boroughs which were regarded as being the property of their patrons. By the Act of Union this property was abolished, and the owners—as they then were—obtained compensation for the loss of their vested interests. Such a thing is happily impossible at present, for now we have no pocket boroughs. It is, however, easy to demonstrate that what happened in 1800 was free from the smallest taint of bribery. Bribery is to give a man money for voting in a particular way. These men, however, got their money—no matter how they voted. The Parnellite, who is always denouncing these money payments as bribery, has never yet had the honesty to give the people the benefit of the following list :—

LIST OF MONEYS PAID TO PEOPLE WHO VOTED *AGAINST* THE ACT OF UNION.

The Duke of Leinster... ...	£28,000	Right Hon. Mr. Ponsonby...	£15,000
The Marquis of Downshire..	52,000	Sir John Parnell	7,500
Lord Granard	30,000	Mr. Tighe	30,000
Lord Belmore	30,000	Sir John Freke	15,000
Lord Lismore	22,500	Mr. La Touche	15,000
Lord Charlemont	15,000	Mr. Gustavus Lambert ...	15,000
Lord Kingston	15,000	The Buxton Family	15,000
Lord Arran	15,000	The King Family...	15,000
Lord Ludlow...	7,500	Mr. Henry Coddington ...	7,000
Lord Belvedere	7,500		

The Speaker—a strong opponent—also received £7,500.

In all, £434,000 was voted by Government to men who were bitter opponents of the Act of Union; while £176,000 went to persons utterly unconnected with politics. Was this bribery? Nor do the Parnellites ever tell their dupes how Grattan and the Opposition raised a fund of £100,000 for undisguised bribery on the other side.

CREATION OF PEERAGES.

It is, however, further urged that the Union was obtained by other corrupt means, and notably by a wholesale creation of titles. It should be explained that William Pitt did reward some of his supporters, though, circumstances considered, not so lavishly as even Mr. Gladstone has rewarded his. Most of Pitt's followers, by passing the Act, *put an end to their own political existence*. Out of 300 members of the Irish House of Commons, only 100 could go to the Imperial Parliament; out of a large House of Irish Peers, only twenty-eight could go to

Westminster. There was hardly an opponent of the Union of any consequence who was not promoted or advanced after 1800, as were Plunket, Ponsonby, Foster, Saurin, Bushe, Curran, and scores of others. Had these men been in favour of the Union, this would have been called corruption.

Enough has surely been said to enable any one to reply to the presposterous historical arguments of the Home Rule party. [For further information, *see* "History of the Irish Legislative Union," by T. Dunbar Ingram, LL.D., published by Macmillan & Co.]

Home Rulers say that the Act of Union has been a failure. When we ask them how they make that out, they tell us that its failure is detected in the following circumstances :—

1. The decline of the population of Ireland.
2. The failure of Ireland to share in the commercial prosperity of Great Britain.
3. The failure of the Union to secure the consent of those who are governed under it.
4. The fact that, since the Act of Union, about 87 "Coercion" Acts have been passed.

It is necessary for a speaker to obtain accurate information on each of these points, for on each of them a complete answer is forthcoming.

1. The Decline of the Population of Ireland.

The following figures give the census returns for each of the three kingdoms since 1801 :—

	England and Wales.	Scotland.	Ireland.
1801	8,392,535	1,608,420	No Government Census till 1821, but population at time of Act of Union, universally estimated as about 5,000,000.
1811	10,164,256	1,805,864	
1821	12,000,236	2,091,521	6,801,827
1831	13,896,797	2,364,286	7,767,401
1841	15,914,148	2,620,184	8,175,124
1851	17,927,609	2,888,742	6,574,278
1861	20,066,224	3,062,294	5,798,967
1871	22,712,266	3,360,018	5,412,377
1881	25,974,439	3,735,873	5,174,836
1891	29,001,018	4,003,103	4,706,162

Now these figures show two things distinctly :—First, that the population of Ireland is decreasing, while that of Great Britain is increasing; secondly, that the Act of Union has got nothing whatever to say to this, *inasmuch as from* 1821 *till* 1841, *at all events the population of Ireland increased just as rapidly as that of the rest of the United Kingdom.*

But every thinking man knows the causes of the decline of the population of Ireland. England and Scotland have increased in population simply because of the growth of the great manufacturing centres, which in turn owe their commerce to the coal and Iron fields of Great Britain. Ireland has neither coal nor iron worth the working, and no commercial centres save in one part of the country, which always goes to prove the Unionist contention as we shall presently see. It may be interesting to know, in corroboration of this, that in every purely agricultural part of Great Britain there is also a decrease in population.

COUNTIES WHICH ARE DECREASING IN POPULATION.

ENGLAND & WALES.	SCOTLAND.
Cambridge.	Berwick.
Cornwall.	Caithness.
Dorset.	Kincardine.
Hereford.	Kinross.
Hunts.	Orkney.
Rutland.	Ross.
Salop.	Sutherland.
Westmoreland.	Wigton.
Brecon.	
Cardigan.	
Montgomery.	
Pembroke.	
Radnor.	

Those towns in Ireland which are centres of industry as distinguished from merely agricultural markets are increasing in size, as is the total town population of places with a population of over 10,000. In 1841, 17 towns had a population of more than 10,000, and an aggregate of 621,003 inhabitants. In 1881, 19 towns had this population, and an aggregate of 814,926.

The following facts, however, demonstrate with still greater force that the Act of Union has nothing whatever to say to the decline in the population of Ireland :—

BELFAST UNDER THE ACT OF UNION.

In 1800 the population of Belfast was				25,000.
In 1830	,,	,,	,,	70,000.
In 1887	,,	,,	,,	220,000.
In 1892	,,	,,	,,	273,055.

Is this also a consequence of the Act of Union? Belfast has thriven under exactly the same Union and Laws as those under which Cork or Limerick decline. At the time of the Act of Union these latter cities were far ahead of it, and it has had no privilege whatever since. We must look elsewhere—to the character of the people—for the cause.

2. COMMERCIAL PROGRESS IN IRELAND.

Much that has been said under the previous head is also relevant here. But what are the facts?

In 1852 the revenue of Ireland was 4½ millions.
In 1888 it was over 7½ millions.
An increase of 77 per cent.!

THE SHIPPING OF IRELAND.

In 1852 the tonnage of shipping entering Irish ports was 5 millions.
In 1885 it was 13 millions.
An increase of 160 per cent.!

THE EXCISE DUTIES OF IRELAND.

In 1852 the Excise Duties of Ireland were 1½ millions.
In 1885 they had grown to 4½ millions.
In 1892 ,, ,, £5,118,292.
An increase of 200 per cent.!

THE SAVINGS BANKS OF IRELAND.

In 1849 the amount in these was £1,200,000.
In 1892 it was £6,057,882.
An increase of 500 per cent.!

THE POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANKS.

(Being the popular banks with poorer depositors.)
In 1870 the amount was only £583,165.
In 1888 it had grown to £3,128,000.
In June, 1886, it was £2,592,000.
In June, 1892, it was £4,069,000.
An increase of 660 per cent. in 22 years!

The same advance is evident in the material prosperity of the people.

HOUSING OF THE PEOPLE.

In 1841 there were 491,278 cabins of the poorest kind.
In 1881 there were but 40,665 of these.
A decrease of 92 per cent.!

In 1841 there were 304,264 houses of the better class.
In 1881 there were 488,968.
An increase of 60 per cent.!

EDUCATION.

In 1841, 28 per cent. of the population (young children excluded) could read and write.
In 1851, 33 per cent.
In 1861, 41 per cent.
In 1871, 49 per cent.
In 1881, 59 per cent.

NATIONAL SCHOOLS.

Year.	No. of Schools.	No. of Pupils.	Amount of Grant.
1837 ...	1,384 ...	169,548 ...	£50,000
1885 ...	7,936 ...	1,075,604 ...	814,000
1891 ...	8,346 ...	1,022,361 ...	866,519

The above figures show conclusively that the prosperity of Ireland has vastly increased since the Act of Union was passed.

APPENDIX VI.

EVICTIONS.

The cry against "Evictions" has played so large a part in the Separatist Compaign, and the misrepresentations regarding Irish Evictions are so constant and enormous that I quote in full the admirable passages in which the late Mr. Arthur Patton dealt with the subject in his most useful "Speaker's Handbook."

THE LAW OF EVICTION.

The following are the most important points.

1. No tenant can be evicted in consequence of a writ of ejectment for non-payment of rent unless he owes a year's rent
2. He may, however, be ejected *on title* if sued for a debt due, and if judgment is given against him. In this case his goods and interest may be put up for auction by the sheriff. How seldom this method is resorted to, figures will prove. The landlord has, however, no more to say to this than has the shopkeeper, or the publican, or the "gombeen man"—*i.e.*, the local money-lender.
3. If evicted for non-payment of rent, the process is as follows:—The landlord obtains his judgment, and then a period of six weeks must elapse before he can proceed further. During the six weeks the tenant can stay eviction by payment in full, or settlement.
4. Prior to the passing of the Land Act of 1887 the landlord next proceeded, in case of a failure to settle, to evict the tenant. The tenant then evicted had a period of six months, during which time he might redeem. He was no longer a tenant, but by paying what was due, or coming to a settlement with his landlord, he could be reinstated, *as he was in the vast majority of cases.* Of course, the land was for these six months absolutely useless to the landlord.
5. During the six months while the tenant was out of possession, the landlord was liable to him for the crops on the land, and for the profits he (the landlord) *might* have made.
6. As a result of this last provision, it happened that after eviction the landlord (in how many cases, figures will tell) reinstated the tenant as a caretaker, though not with the rights of a tenant. At the end of the six months the period of redemption expired. The tenant was on the land as caretaker. If he settled, he became

a tenant; if not, and if he refused possession, a second physical removal might have to take place. Having lost his tenancy, he became a trespasser.

7. Of course, in addition to what is stated above, it must never be forgotten that the tenant could secure the value of improvements made by him, by compensation or by the benefit of Free Sale. These matters have already been described at length under the Acts of 1870 and 1881.
8. An important change was made in the law by the Act of 1887. This Act placed the physical eviction at the end of the six months allowed for redemption, instead of at the beginning. It provided that in all cases where the rent was under £100 (that is, in over 94 per cent. of the holdings of Ireland) the landlord who was entitled to evict should not resort to physical eviction in the first instance. A written notice sent to the tenant, after Judgment had been obtained, and at the termination of a series of legal proceedings of which he must be fully cognisant, makes him a caretaker. He then has six months to redeem, and does redeem in the vast majority of instances.
9. These written notices are known as "eviction" notices, but they precede actual eviction by six months. In the overwhelming majority of cases actual eviction never succeeds. The most laughable mistakes have been made on this subject, as by Lord Ripon, who, speaking in October, 1888, spoke of many thousand evictions as likely to take place in Ireland because of the number of eviction notices; while some thousand eviction notices in the preceding quarter had been followed by only eighty-six evictions! Sir George Trevelyan, speaking at Hexham on the 28th of September, 1889, without Lord Ripon's excuse of ignorance, stated that "in 1888, 9,752 families lost their homes in Ireland." The statement, which certainly conveyed to his hearers the idea that these persons were left desolate and homeless by eviction, was in that sense *absolutely untrue*.

On this subject every method of exaggeration is employed. There are, however, seven distinct methods employed in this connection to trap the unwary. These are:—

1. The use of extravagant language.
2. The confusion of persons with families, by the artful employment of which trick the Nationalists make evictions appear about seven times as numerous as they really are.

3. The assumption that of the total number of evictions all are by landlords.

4. The absolute ignoring of the fact that many evicted tenants are at once reinstated as tenants.

5. The absolute ignoring of the fact that very many evicted tenants are readmitted as caretakers, and ultimately redeem their position as tenants.

6. The confusion of eviction notices with evictions.

7. The assumption that if the landlord anywhere evicts a tenant, the landlord alone is to blame.

As to the first of these, *the use of extravagant language*, we shall give one specimen of Nationalist methods. Speaking in the House of Commons in August, 1886, Mr. Parnell said: "If it were not for 'moonlighting,' Lord Kenmare would not leave a roof over the heads of any of his tenants."—while *United Ireland* described the same landlord as the "Evictor-General of Ireland." What are the facts? Lord Kenmare holds 91,000 acres, on which are 1,800 tenants. In the seven years, 1860–66, he evicted nine tenants, or $1\frac{2}{7}$ per annum. Such was the conduct of the "Evictor-General," and such is the invariable method of the Parnellite press.

A favorite Nationalist trick is to *confuse persons with families*. At election times a Nationalist placard is generally exhibited, stating that during the last fifty years 3,668,000 Irish persons have been evicted! The authority given for this statement is a work called "Fifty Years' National Progress," by Michael G. Mulhall.

The following is Mr. Mulhall's statement in his own words:—

"Official returns give the number of families, and these averaging seven persons, we ascertain the actual number of persons evicted:—

FALSE.

Years.		Families.		Persons.
1849–51	...	263,000	...	1,841,000
1852–60	...	110,000	...	770,000
1861–70	...	47,000	...	329,000
1871–86	...	104,000	...	728,000
Total	...	524,000		3,668,000

The foregoing is Mr. Mulhall's statement, given on pp 114 and 115 of his book. What are the facts?

The official returns give, not what Mr. Mulhall alleges, but the following figures :—

TRUE.

Years.		Families.		Persons.
1849-51	...	49,000	...	263,000
1852-60	...	22,000	...	110,000
1861-70	...	9,700	...	47,000
1871-86	...	20,000	...	104,000
Total	...	100,700	...	524,000

The following is a list of the actual evictions since 1886 :—

1886 ...	3,781
1887 ...	3,869
1888 ...	1,609
1889 ...	1,356
1890 ...	1,421
1891 ...	799

79 per cent. decrease in evictions from 1886 to 1891.

In other words, PERSONS in the official returns were transmuted into FAMILIES, then the figures were multiplied by 7 to make them persons, and so the current Nationalist numbers are based on a calculation which makes every Irish farmer the parent of about 35 children.

As a matter of actual fact, about 100,000 families, and 524,000 persons, are given in the official returns as evicted between 1849 and 1886. That means 100,000 evictions in 38 years, which on an average is less than 3,000 evictions a year. Whether this number is large or small can only be determined after patient investigation. The following considerations help to determine it :—

The official returns as quoted include every case where the eviction was follow by readmission, either as tenant or caretaker, and also every case whether eviction was at the suit of the landlord or not; also every eviction in the towns of Ireland, Dublin alone excepted.

In 1887 a vigorous attempt was made by the Irish Loyal and Patriotic Union to investigate every case of eviction in Ireland which had taken place during the year 1886. In that year there were 3,781 evictions, representing 19,500 persons. The figures appeared very large to unthinking persons, but investigation soon reduced them to their proper proportions.

Full particulars were obtained in 3,024 of these evictions, with the following results :—

434, or 14 per cent., were out of dwelling-houses in cities and towns, and so quite unconnected with the land question.

67, or two per cent., were out of accommodation holdings held by persons living in a town. These holdings are not

agricultural, and were, therefore, rigidly excluded by Mr. Gladstone from the Act of 1881.

305, or over 10 per cent., were cases where no physical eviction could take place because no one resided on the holdings. The tenant had either lived on an adjacent farm or had left the place derelict.

198 cases, or over 6 per cent., were "on title." On investigation it turned out that these were either cases of (1) trespassers unlawfully squatting on land to which they had not any right, (2) persons wrongfully in possession under disputed wills, or (3) cases where the local shopkeeper or money-lender bought up and sold the interest of the tenant to pay his debt.

The cases already enumerated reduce the 3,024 cases of eviction to 2,020. In other words, 33 per cent., one third, disappear at once.

The further reductions are, however, still more remarkable. In 518 cases, about 17 per cent of the total, the tenants were reinstated *as tenants*. In other words they were able to pay, and did pay; or, if not, they were leniently treated.

In 916 cases, however, the tenants were re-admitted as caretakers, pending redemption—that is in almost one third of the entire number. Now these 916 either came to a settlement with their landlord in the six months, or they did not. Whether they did or not, they were not by eviction deprived, as Englishmen and Scotchmen often think, of their interest. They had six months in which they might sell their interest, as already explained, for a sum far exceeding the landlord's demand, and so depart with the money in their pockets; and this was actually done *in a large number of cases*.

As a matter of fact, however, out of 3,024 evictions only 2,020 were from agricultural holdings with residences attached thereto, and for non-payment of rent. Out of these 2,020 only 586 were cases where the tenants were not immediately re-admitted in some form. Of these 586 every evicted tenant was entitled to compensation for improvements; or to the right of Free Sale, and to any profit the landlord might make out of the farm while the tenant was out of possession during the ensuing six months.

There was nothing exceptional about 1886, and there can be no doubt that if other years had been examined in the same way, it would appear that out of 100 recorded evictions, 33 per cent. are unconnected with agriculture, or non-residential, while in at least 45 per cent. tenants are at once re-admitted.

We have now seen how 3,024 investigated evictions in Ireland

give us really 586. The official number for 1886 was, however, 3,781. Making a liberal allowance we can assume not more than 800 physical evictions as actually taking place in that year. It may be interesting to inquire what proportion these evictions bear to the total number of holdings in the country.

The number of holdings was in that year 560,000, so 800 evictions means that out of every 700 tenants in Ireland one was evicted, and one only! These figures certainly fail to bear out the extravagant language of the Nationalists.

It is, of course, currently assumed that all evictions arise out of the fault of the landlord. How far this is true will be considered when we come to deal with the Plan of Campaign, under which most recent Irish evictions have taken place. (See p. 126.)

EVICTIONS IN THE ABSTRACT.

It may sometimes be necessary for a speaker distinctly to address an audience on evictions in the abstract, and to ask them distinctly, are all evictions wrong?

It must be carefully remembered that this is a current belief of the Nationalists. They denounce *all* evictions alike, whether these spring from the rapacity of a landlord or the dishonesty of a tenant. Eviction is repeatedly called a *crime*, and no limitation whatever is introduced in the language of the speaker to show that he is referring to the particular circumstances of the case. If this be not so, it would be interesting to learn from a Nationalist of a single eviction which has ever taken place in Ireland of which he or his party have approved. There is not a single case on record where the Nationalists have said to a tenant, "Really, this is reasonable; you ought to pay." *No such case has ever occurred*, for the Nationalist policy is to denounce all evictions alike.

Now, if all evictions are unjust, they ought to be put a stop to at once in Ireland, and in Scotland and England also. The working classes ought, however, to be asked, How would this affect them?

In the first place, the building societies of the country would be bankrupt in three months. They would have lost their right of enforcing payment from a defaulting member.

The price of houses would go up enormously. No one would sell a house he owned save for full cash down. No one would let a house save at a rent sufficiently large to recompense him for the risk of meeting a dishonest tenant.

As for new buildings, that would simply be out of the question.

In other words, the abolition of eviction altogether would mean simple ruin to the working classes of the country.*

A clear statement of these facts will at once enable audiences to perceive that before one declaims against eviction, it is necessary to examine the facts of each eviction, and to ascertain whether Irish evictions are just or unjust.

ARE IRISH EVICTIONS UNJUST?

It has already been pointed out at length that eviction does not make a tenant lose his improvements in his holding, or the right to sell his interest; it simply prevents him retaining the landlord's property without paying for it.

The following facts will probably prove of interest:—

In 1886, an average year, the following was the average amount of rent due by Irish tenants who were evicted from agricultural holdings on which they resided:—

Number per cent. of Evicted Tenants.						Amount of Rent due.	
11·9			owed			1 year's rent.	
17·1	...	...	,,	...	...	1½	,,
20·2	...	...	,,	...	...	2	,,
13·9	...	...	,,	...	...	2½	,,
13·6	...	...	,,	...	...	3	,,
6·8	...	...	,,	...	...	3½	,,
6·5	...	...	,,	...	...	4	,,
1·8	...	...	,,	...	...	4½	,,
1·7	...	...	,,	...	...	5	,,
1·1	...	...	,,	...	...	5½	,,
2·1	...	...	,,	...	...	6	,,
3·3	...	owed more than			...	6	,,

THE GLENBEIGH EVICTIONS.

These evictions were, for a long time, utilised for election purposes by the Nationalists, who drew eloquent pictures of the eviction of poor people, while carefully concealing the facts of the case.

They are still constantly alluded to. Mr. Campbell Bannerman, M.P., is reported to have said at Greenock on November 2nd, 1888, that only for the conduct of his opponents there would have been no Glenbeigh in Ireland. This, he alleged, was caused by the failure of the Unionist Party to deal with the question of arrears.

This is a species of reckless assertion which can only be met by the recital of facts.

* This point is admirably explained in "Think It Out," a lecture by Thomas Hodgkin, D.C.L.

At Glenbeigh 70 tenants owed £6,177, a sum representing at least 3½ years' rent. The agent was at first willing to take one year's rent and costs, about £1,800, the total rental being £1,731 per annum. At a later date the agent expressed his willingness to take £865 and costs, about £900 in all, and to wipe out £5,312, *including all arrears*. The arrears question had therefore nothing in the world to do with the Glenbeigh evictions. At first all the tenants accepted this offer and promised to pay. As a fact, only 17 paid, but 53 refused to pay anything on gale-day. Their priest wrote of these 53 that they were "poor slaves who would not keep their word." It will scarcely be credited that after the offer of the agent to accept £865, and to forgive £5,312 out of £6,177, and before evictions took place, a document was signed by the following members of Parliament—Messrs. Dillon, Mahony, E. Harrington, and Conybeare—denouncing the agent's conduct as "barbarous and inhuman."

These are the facts of a stock-case of Nationalist horrors. The usual plan is to try and excite sympathy by pictures of poor persons suffering from eviction, and by the absolute suppression of all facts which would throw light on the justice or injustice of the case.

THE PLAN OF CAMPAIGN.

There can be no dispute as to what the Plan of Campaign is; it was first announced in the supplement to *United Ireland* on Saturday, November 20th, 1886.

Briefly summarised the Plan is as follows:—

The tenantry on a given estate meet, each tenant pledging himself to abide by the decision of the majority, to hold no personal communication with the landlord or his agent, and to accept no terms not given to every one. The rents may be old rents, judicial rents, or fixed in any way. The landlord has probably offered an abatement, possibly an all-round abatement, but not as large as the tenantry want, or he has refused an all-round abatement, but offered separate abatements to each tenant according to circumstances. This offer is refused. The tenants formulate their demand. On gale-day they go to the rent office in a body. If the agent will not see them *all*, they send their chairman, generally the priest, to demand the all-round abatement they require, the well-to-do farmer asking as much as the poor cottier. The landlord is then offered his rent less by this abatement of 30, 40, or 50 per cent. If he takes it, there the matter ends. If he refuses, the money is lodged with trustees—to be used, if necessary, to fight the landlord.

The illegality of the Plan has been distinctly declared by the

Courts of Law in the cases of Blunt *v.* Byrne, and of Flowen *v.* Dillon. Its illegality has no connection whatever with the Crimes Act. In England or in Ireland alike any meeting called to advocate it may be dispersed by force, like any other meeting called for any other illegal object.

The chief apologies put forth for the Plan of Campaign are (1) necessity, (2) that the demands made under it are fair, since the Law Courts have conceded similar abatements, (3) that it never would have originated at all only for the rejection of Mr. Parnell's Bill of 1886.

A short examination of the facts will completely demolish all these defences, and will distinctly prove that the Plan of Campaign has been put in force where these apologies cannot be maintained. It will be advisable to give as instances a brief statement of the leading facts on the chief estates where it has been tried. Such are the Massereene estate, the Ponsonby estate, the Kingston estate, the Lansdowne estate, the O'Grady estate, the Brooke estate, and the Vandeleur estate.

THE MASSEREENE ESTATE.

On this estate there are 327 holdings. In 90 the tenants had judicial rents, and had further abatements given them under the Act of 1887. Twenty tenants were leaseholders, and to them, as well as to all the others, the Courts were open. The rental was under the Government valuation. The "arrears" question did not affect this case, for though these were large the landlord offered at once to estimate them as if they had been reduced by the Land Commission. He asked for them on the basis of the latest judicial reductions. In other words, he asked for arrears of "fair" rent, to which he was obviuosly entitled in common honesty, and not for arrears of a rack-rent. *The Protestant tenants, 36 in number, stood out to a man* against the plan of Campaign. They thought the landlord fair and reasonable, and the "Plan" dishonest. 64 *Roman Catholic tenants also declined to join the conspiracy.*

THE PONSONBY ESTATE.

This estate is in Cork, and its area is 10,000 acres. The rental is £7,800. The rents have never been raised within the memory of the oldest inhabitant, and so fair are these that out of 300 tenants who might have gone into Court only 50 did so. In 1880 the landlord voluntarily gave abatements of from 15 to 20 per cent., and forgave some thousands of pounds of arrears. In 1886

the landlord voluntarily offered abatements of 20 per cent. on non-judicial, and 10 per cent. on judicial rents; he was also willing to forgive all arrears on payment of one year's rent. In other words, he was willing to forego £6,000 of debt. The rents were collected from the tenants by Mr. Lane, M.P., for the Plan; and the landlord got nothing. He was obliged to evict 9 tenants.

Such was the condition of affairs at the close of 1888. Since when Mr. Smith-Barry, M.P., and a syndicate formed by him, have purchased the estate from Mr. Ponsonby. Mr. Smith-Barry's company then offered the tenants their farms on certain terms of purchase, or that they could remain as tenants under a fair rent fixed by the Land Court; any decision of that Court to be regarded as retrospective, *so as to cover arrears.*

THE KINGSTON ESTATE.

This estate is close to Mitchelstown, County Cork, and belongs to the Countess of Kingston. There are 700 agricultural tenants, 550 of whom were granted leases by the late earl, for which they publicly thanked him and gave him an illuminated address. Rent was always well paid without complaint, and in 1880 there were practically no arrears. Then came the "No Rent" manifesto, and the entire case altered. In 1881 the leaseholders were allowed and invited to go into Court and get "fair rents" fixed, but only one of the 550 leaseholders would do so. In 1886 the tenants demanded a uniform abatement of 20 per cent.; the landlord offered from 10 to 25 per cent., to vary according to individual circumstances. This offer was, *on the average*, the same as that of the Campaigners, but very different in fact. Under the Plan the well-to-do farmer was to get as much as the poor cottier; under the landlord's sliding scale large relief was offered to the poor, and little or nothing to those who were able to pay. Accordingly Mr. William O'Brien, M.P., Mr. John O'Connor, M.P., and Dr. Tanner, M.P., collected the rents for the Plan on December 8th, 1886. In December, 1887, the Land Act of that year came into force. Many tenants who had been leaseholders, 545 in all, went into Court. Judgment was speedily delivered in 120 cases, in which the rental of £2,668 was reduced by £511. This, being an average reduction of 20 per cent., was claimed as an indication that the demand of the Plan of Campaign was just, but he actually corroborated the landlord's sliding scale, giving no reduction whatever in some cases, and a large reduction in others.

THE LUGGACURRAN ESTATE.

This estate is in the Queen's County, and belongs to the Marquis of Lansdowne. Almost all the tenants are non-judicial

tenants, very few being leaseholders, and very few having asked the Courts to fix their rents. The rental is £7,000, out of which the landlord allows £1,100 to be annually spent on the estate. In 1886 the tenants demanded 35 per cent. on *non-judicial* and 25 per cent. on *judicial* rents, threatening to adopt the Plan of Campaign as an alternative. The landlord refused this demand, but offered to give reductions varying from 15 per cent. to 25 per cent. on non-judicial rents, There was no question as to the ability of: he tenants to pay, Mr. Denis Kilbride, M.P., stating as follows:—"The Luggacurran evictions differed from most of the other evictions to this extent—that *they were able to pay the rent;* it was a fight of intelligence against intelligence; it was diamond cut diamond." (*Freeman's Journal*, March 30th, 1887.) The Marquis of Lansdowne was obliged ultimately to enforce his rights, and several tenants were evicted, among them Mr. Kilbride, who occupied a large farm of over 700 acres, with a modern residence and large outhouses (all built by the landlord), at a rental of £760. Another evicted tenant was Mr. John Dunne, renting a large farm of 1,304 acres. This gentleman was able to enter a racehorse for the Curragh after his eviction. *All the Protestants on this estate refused to join the Plan, and all paid their rents.*

THE O'GRADY ESTATE.

The rental on this estate was never raised, nor was there ever an eviction on the O'Grady property till after the Plan of Campaign. The rental, which in 1881 amounted to £2,108, was reduced after a report by a valuator in 1882 to £1,616. There were forty-two tenants, and in 1883 thirty-eight of these took leases. In 1885 The O'Grady gave a further abatement from 15 to 25 per cent., subject to which the rent *was cheerfully paid.*

In October, 1886, he gave orders to the agent to give a similar abatement; but Father Ryan, C.C., told the tenants to demand 30 per cent. on judicial and 40 on non-judicial rents. Ultimately the Plan was persisted in, and six tenants wereevicted. It was in connection with this estate that the case of Tom Moroney occurred. Moroney's rent was £85. For that he had a large public-house, five small houses, the tolls of the Herbertstown fairs, and thirty-seven acres of land. The tolls alone amounted in value to between £50 and £60 per annum. The landlord offered an abatement to Moroney of 25 per cent.—that is, he asked for £64, which Moroney was notoriously able to pay. When a writ was issued, Moroney sold his cattle under what is called a Plan of Campaign auction, whereupon the money was lodged with trustees. Moroney was accordingly declared a bankrupt, *as he would have been in England or Scotland.* For refusing

to be sworn in court, lest he should have to tell what became of his goods, thus fraudulently hidden away, he was subsequently put in prison, *as he would have been in England or Scotland.* He could have got out of prison any day by abandoning the fraud and answering the Court, *as he also could in England or Scotland.* For months his friends represented that he was dying in gaol, both his mind and body being injuriously affected. Suddenly he was released at the request of the landlord, whereupon his health was immediately alleged by the same parties to have been improved during his stay in prison.

THE BROOKE, OR COOLGREANY ESTATE.

This estate is in the County of Wexford, near Coolgreany. The landlord has made all the improvements in the estate without ever raising the rent. In 1881 an abatement of 25 per cent. was made, and the tenantry were urged to get fair rents fixed. Acting on the advice of the Land League, they refused to avail themselves of the Act of 1881, and demanded other abatements instead. This was refused, and forty writs were issued, whereupon they *all paid full rents* at once. There are 114 tenants—15 have judicial rents, 22 are leaseholders, and 77 are non-judicial tenants. In 1886 the Plan of Campaign was started. The following were the demands of the tenantry:—(1) That an all-round reduction of 30 per cent. should be given; (2) that a Protestant named Webster should be evicted from a farm for which he had paid the rent; and (3) that a Roman Catholic named Lenehan, who had not paid and had been evicted, should be reinstated. Eighty tenants joined the Plan, and Sir Thomas Esmonde, M.P., and Mr. Mayne, M.P., took their money. *All the Protestants on the estate* paid their rents less the abatement offered, were quite satisfied, and *declined to have anything to do with the Plan of Campaign.* Ultimately evictions commenced, and 70 holdings were cleared. Coolgreany has since been "planted." Of course, the tenants who refused to join in "The Plan" have been boycotted, though they had a perfect right to refuse if they choose.

THE VANDELEUR ESTATE.

This estate is in the County Clare; it consists of 20,000 acres, and there are 800 tenants. In 1873, after a succession of good seasons, rents were raised, but to a figure much below the average rental of the country or of the County Clare. If the rents so raised were fair, the tenants had no cause for complaint; if they were unfair, they had no cause for complaint either,

inasmuch as they were allowed to pay, so that in 1881 they owed £30,000 of arrears. In the same year the Land Act passed, and in 1882 came the Arrears Act, which wiped out the entire arrears of nearly every tenant. By the end of 1882 the arrears of £30,000 had disappeared. Out of the 800 tenants, 200 only asked for judicial rents, the remaining 600 being satisfied with the landlord's treatment. In September, 1886, the agent made an offer of 20 per cent. reduction on non-judicial rents. *Two hundred and fifty of the tenants received these terms gladly, and paid at once.* Two months later Messrs. Cox, M.P., and Jordan, M.P., visited the estate, and the Plan of Campaign was started. The poorer tenantry were, however, forbidden to join, so only 120 of the wealthier farmers did so; they were considered better able to fight. With the poorer tenants the landlord was quite willing to settle, and did settle. Ultimately the landlord offered to take two-thirds of a year's rent in discharge of all rent due from each tenant; but the Plan insisted on more, so the landlord was driven to exercise his legal rights. Twenty-four tenants were evicted. These held 1,026 statute acres at an annual rental of £626. They owed £2,406. The landlord's offer was to forgive £1,469 altogether. He asked for £459 at once, £459 before the end of the year, and £50 costs—in all, £939—in discharge of a debt of £2,406. The landlord having received *no rent at all* from March 31st, 1885, up to May, 1889, at last capitulated. What was called an "arbitration" was resorted to, to cover his retreat.

THE OLPHERT ESTATE.

On this estate were 460 tenants, of whom 220 had judicial rents. The estate was wiped clear of all arrears by the Act of 1882. Mr. Olphert has always resided with his tenants, never sleeping off his estate. He never had any trouble with them until the League was formed. In July, 1884, he evicted 32 tenants, who, however, paid up and were reinstated. For more than two years prior to the recent evictions no rent was paid. The Plan of Campaign was adopted and an all round reduction demanded. The landlord offered 25 per cent. to non-judicial tenants and 10 per cent. to those with fair rents, while he asked for *no arrears*. The "fair rent" tenants had also abatements in addition under the Act of 1887, or a reduction of about 33 per cent. The landlord's offer was refused and no rent was paid. Fourteen tenants were evicted—*all with fair rents—fixed by Mr. Pierce Mahony* (now Parnellite M.P.). The poor law valuation of the holdings was £58 10s. 0d., the old rent £69 18s. 6d., and the judicial rent £56 12s. 0d. *Every Protestant tenant settled with the landlord.* The tenant-right on this estate

was particularly valuable. Patrick McElroy, rent £2 4s. per annum, sold his tenant-right to John McGinley for £60, while Father McFadden of Gweedore sold his tenant-right in a holding subject to a rent of £1 2s. 6d. per annum for £115! (See Free Sale).

THE KENMARE ESTATE.

This estate is the largest in Ireland, extending over 100,000 acres, and Killarney is its centre. Between 1851 and 1885 Lord Kenmare spent £129,314 out of his own pocket on improvements ,and also got £34,500 from the Board of Works for the same purpose, never charging a single tenant a penny interest, though the money was all spent in building, fencing, draining, and the like. Wherever there is a good house, it has been built with Lord Kenmare's money, and the Land Commissioners always reported that the rental was moderate. In August, 1888, everything was comparatively quiet, when the following letter was written to start the Plan of Campaign :—

"Telephone No. 3,070. Telegraphic address, 'Hostelry,' London,
"Confidential.
"Westminster Palace Hotel, Victoria Street, London. S.W.,
"August 25th, 1888.

"My dear Sheehan,—It will be most necessary to show Balfour that his troubles in Ireland are only beginning. We are arranging a series of great demonstrations through Ireland for the latter end of September and beginning of October. You ought to arrange a series of meetings from parish to parish in your division to address your constituents, announcing them publicly. I will, if possible, address some one of them myself. Don't mention my name publicly as suggesting the meetings. You cannot announce too many of them, but one will do to begin, any Sunday after next.

"Ever yours sincerely,
"J. D. Sheehan, Esq., M.P." "WILLIAM O'BRIEN.

The Plan was adopted, and a reduction of 40 per cent. demanded. Moonlighting accompanied it, having previously altogether subsided from earlier days. The Plan gradually lingered, and the latest news is that it has altogether collapsed on a large part of the estate, where it was never a voluntary enterprise on the part of the tenants, but was enforced by every species of terrorism.

THE SMITH-BARRY ESTATE.

The case of this estate is, perhaps, the latest, as it is certainly the most unique of all. Mr. Smith-Barry, M.P., had, as has been seen, intervened in the case of the Ponsonby tenants. It has never been alleged for a moment that the rents on his estate were not perfectly fair, or that the tenants were unable to pay them. In August, 1889, however, a meeting of the Smith-Barry tenants was held, and attended (why?) by Mr. William O'Brien, M.P. At

this meeting resolutions were passed pledging the tenants to assist the campaigners on the Ponsonby estate in Cork; and it was further decided that each of the tenants on Mr. Smith-Barry's estate in Tipperary should pay an assessment amounting to 10 per cent. on the Government valuation of their holdings, to form a fund for the benefit of the Ponsonby tenants. A further resolution was then passed to the effect that, as the voluntary assessment would bear somewhat heavily on the Tipperary tenants, they should demand 25 per cent. off their rents from their landlord, and thus make money by their noble generosity! This being declined, payment was refused, whereupon the landlord went to law to recover his rents. He recovered judgment against 20 tenants, who, in almost every case, at once capitulated and paid their debts. As a result, their windows were smashed and they were boycotted. Having first capitulated to the landlord, these tenants have now been compelled to capitulate to the League, and further conflict is imminent.

SUMMARY OF CAMPAIGN ESTATES.

The facts briefly given will indicate the working of the Plan of Campaign. Those, however, who desire further and fuller information will find it in the publications of the Irish Loyal and Patriotic Union dealing with the subject; and, in the case of the Vandeleur estate, in the letters of Mr. T. W. Russell, M.P., written to the *Times*, and republished. What has been here given shows the utter untruth of the following statements:—

(*a*) That the Plan is a combination to help the poor.

(*b*) That it is caused by necessity.

(*c*) That it is caused by "arrears."

(*d*) That it is the offspring of the rejection of Mr. Parnell's Bill of 1886.

A final word may be urged in connection with this last point. Mr. Gladstone, in a speech at Hampstead, has distinctly stated, "The Plan of Campaign sprang out of that rejection." How utterly untrue this is, will be seen at once, if it is remembered that Mr. Parnell's Bill proposed to do nothing for the non-judicial tenants, who, nevertheless, have joined actively in the Plan of Campaign. If by the passing of Mr. Parnell's Bill, the Plan of Campaign would have been obviated, these non-judicial tenants are now acting with gross dishonesty; if this be not so, the Bill, could not have prevented the Plan. On the Luggacurran estate, for instance, not more than two or three tenants could possibly have been effected by Mr. Parnell's Bill, but Mr. William O'Brien, M.P., worked the Plan there on behalf of all the tenants. On the

Coolgreany estate, again, 77 tenants would have been utterly unaffected by that Bill, yet 50 of these joined in the Plan, with the encouragement of the entire Nationalist Party.

In view of these considerations it may be well to notice that the *Daily News*, which was favourable to Mr. Parnell's Bill, spoke thus of the Plan of Campaign: "WE BY NO MEANS APPROVE OF MR. DILLON'S POLICY. HIS 'PLAN OF CAMPAIGN' SEEMS TO US VITIATED WITH DISHONESTY."—(*Daily News*, December 6, 1886.

APPENDIX VII.

THE UNION OF HEARTS.

The chief argument used by the Gladstonians in support of their policy of a separate Parliament, or "Home Rule" for Ireland, is that a vast majority of the Irish people ardently desire it.

There are 4,700,000 people in Ireland. Out of these at least 1,750,000 are bitterly opposed to "Home Rule," *i.e.*, more than one out of every three.

They regard it as injurious to Ireland and fatal to their own safety and well being. The opponents of Irish "Home Rule" embrace nearly all the Protestants of Ireland and a large number of the most intelligent Roman Catholics. It is notorious that the great industrial and progressive centres of Ulster, where the manufacture and wealth of Ireland lie (such as Belfast and Londonderry), and a considerable part of Dublin, are entirely opposed to the Gladstonian policy.

Over 95 per cent. of all the Protestant bodies of Ireland—Presbyterians, Wesleyans, Baptists, Independents, as well as Episcopalians—protest that they will never submit to a separate Parliament, which would be under the control of the Fenians or the priests.

Therefore, at the highest computation, in order to please some 3,000,000 of disaffected Irish Roman Catholics, Mr. Gladstone proposed, in 1886 and again in 1893, to break up the United Kingdom, numbering nearly 38,000,000 of people, and to dismember the British Empire, which embraces over 340,000,000 souls.

In 1886 it might have been said that 85 Irish Nationalist members, representing some 3,000,000 of disloyal Irish Roman

Catholics, were united under Mr. Parnell in demanding "Home Rule."

But what is the case now? The Nationalist party is split up into two factions, who hate and revile each other even more fiercely than the Nationalist party used to hate and revile Mr. Arthur Balfour and the British administration. This split began in Committee Room No. 15, in November, 1890, and it has raged with increasing violence ever since.

The bye-elections at Kilkenny, at Cork, and at Waterford, between Parnellites and Anti-Parnellites, were attended with furious rioting and most vituperative abuse directed by Irish Nationalists against each other. The Cork election resembled a battlefield. Hundreds of persons were injured. But for the presence and active intervention of British soldiers and of the Royal Irish Constabulary there would have been terrible bloodshed and general anarchy.

But for the active and constant protection of the Royal Irish Constabulary, "Balfour's Hellhounds," and of British soldiers and of Resident Magistrates, the much abused "Removables," Mr. Timothy Healy would have hanged to many a lamp post in Dublin, and Mr. William O'Brien, Mr. John Dillon, and Mr. Michael Davitt would have been stoned or bludgeoned to death in Cork and Waterford.

Instead of a united Nationalist party of 85 members opposing the 18 Loyalist members, there are now two furiously antagonistic Nationalist parties, numbering respectively 9 and 71 members, denouncing and attacking each other more savagely than they attack the Loyalists and the British Government. On the one side are the Parnellites and Fenians; on the other side the Priests and Anti-Parnellites.

Dividing the 3,000,000 of Irish Separatists between these factions in the proportion of the voting for the Parliamentary contests it would give about 2,000,000 to the Anti-Parnellites and 1,000,000 to the Parnellites.

It is more than doubtful whether even the Anti-Parnellites sincerely accept the Gladstonian "Home Rule" scheme, because they have repudiated Sir William Harcourt's condition that the Imperial Parliament should remain supreme over the separate Irish Parliament.

But granting that the Anti-Parnellites would be willing to accept the Gladstonian "Home Rule," the striking fact remains that, in order to doubtfully satisfy some 2,000,000 of disloyal Roman Catholic Irishmen, who follow Messrs. McCarthy, W. O'Brien,

Dillon and Davitt, Mr. Gladstone is willing to break up the United Kingdom, with its nearly 38,000,000 of people, who now dwell in peace and prosperity under the Imperial Parliament, and to imperil the integrity of the whole British Empire.

Was there ever a proposal more monstrous and more wicked?

But the tendency of the Irish Nationalists is (to use a favourite word of Mr. John Morley's) increasingly "fissiparous." The Anti-Parnellite party has itself broken up into several factions, which indulge each other in the usual Nationalist style. The disgraceful scenes and furious vituperation which mark the quarrels of Messrs. Healy and Dillon over the *Freeman's Journal* are but specimens of what would occur in every district of Ireland if the "Home Rulers" had supreme control. Last July (1892), the opposing factions of Nationalists, Parnellites, and Anti-Parnellites were only prevented from murdering each other in Cork, Tralee, and many other places by the intervention of the Royal Irish Constabulary. Some specimens of the choice abuse, with which the Irish Factions so freely bespattered each other, will be found below.

In order to prove the bitter hatred felt and shown by the two Irish Nationalist factions towards each other, the following extracts from their own utterances are given:—

Anti-Parnellites on Parnellites.

Mr. T. Healy, M.P., on Mrs. Parnell.

Mr. T. M. Healy, M.P., speaking at a Federation meeting in Longford, said:—

"I say no more shocking incident has been heard of than this alliance between so-called Irish Patriots and a proved British prostitute."—*Roscommon Herald*, 7th November, 1891.

Mr. M. J. Kenny, M.P., on the Parnellites.

Mr. M. J. Kenny, M.P., speaking at Tullamore Convention, said:—

"The fate of these thirty factionists would not be more acceptable to them than the fate of the Gadarean swine who rushed into the sea of Gennesareth."—*National Press*, 13th November, 1891.

Parnellites on Anti-Parnellites.

Mr. Parnell on the McCarthyites.

Mr. Parnell, speaking at the Kilkenny election, made use of the following language:—

"If I had ever made my position in Irish politics and in Irish public life a personal question, the miserable gutter sparrows who were once my comrades would not be in a position to come here to-day. It was because I pushed forward these men out of their obscurity and gave them a better chance than I gave myself, that these miserable wretches dare to blame the leader of the Irish people behind his back. But I will not waste my time and my breath upon such scum,"—*Freeman's Journal*, 15th December, 1890.

Anti-Parnellites on Parnellites.

Mr. W. O'Brien, M.P., on Redmondism.

Mr. Wm. O'Brien, M.P., speaking at Galway Convention, said:—

"It is a remarkable fact that you will find the area of Redmondism is precisely coterminous with the area of riot. Redmondism and rowdyism are practically convertible terms. We know that wherever the Redmondites are in force there is no argument except the bludgeon and the paving-stone."—*National Press*, 18th December, 1891.

Mr. M. J. Kenny, M.P., at the Tullamore convention, further said:—

"He ventured to think that human baseness had touched the bottom at last, and that it had touched the bottom in the person of Mr. Timothy Harrington."—*National Press*, 13th November, 1891.

Mr. Wm. O'Brien, M.P., in the same speech at Cork election, 28th October, 1891:—

"No, what Mr. Redmond proposes and proposed were not settlements. They were abject and ignominious skedaddles, like his own skedaddles from Mr. Parnell, until he was driven back by newspaper paragraphs; and all I can say is this, we don't want him and his any longer."—*National Press*, 28th October, 1881.

Parnellites on Anti-Parnellites.

Mr. McDonald, M.P., on Mr. McCarthy.

Mr. W. A. Macdonald, M.P., speaking at an election meeting in Kilkenny, said:—

"He had got a letter that day accusing him of being false to his pledges. Who was to be the new leader of the people? Mr. Justin McCarthy, the writer of second-rate novels and of third-rate histories, a man of no political strength or foresight."—*Freeman's Journal*, 18th December, 1890.

Mr. P. Mahony, M.P., on the Anti-Parnellites.

Mr. Pierce Mahony, M.P., at a National League meeting at Limerick, said:—

"The Leaders asked them to shake hands over the grave of the dead chief; well, he could say for himself he would rather be dead, he would rather be in his coffin. He would never have anything to do with that wretched cowardly crew again."—*United Ireland*, 14th November, 1891.

Mr. T. Harrington, M.P., on Messrs. Dillon & O'Brien.

Mr. Timothy Harrington, M.P., speaking at the Central Branch of the Irish National League, said:—

"Dillon and O'Brien had given to the public a description of the Boulogne negotiations, which for unfair dealing, for gross misrepresentation of political opponents, was as shameful an imposture as was ever given to the Irish public.

"When they reflected on the hypocrisy of these men they must be forced to the conclusion that neither the future of the country nor the struggle for liberty in the country could be safe in their hands.

"Now what he complained of as a shameful and foul act was that Mr. O'Brien should publish a garbled description of this, and altogether suppress the letter of Mr. Parnell."—*Freeman's Journal*, 18th November, 1891.

Anti-Parnellites on Parnellites.

Mr. Kilbride, M.P., on Mr. J. E. Redmond, M.P.

Mr. Kilbride, M.P., speaking at the Sligo Convention, said:—

"The evicted tenants are indebted to Mr. John E. Redmond, M.P., and Mr. Ned Leamy for their present unfortunate position. Mr. John Redmond was a strong supporter of the evicted tenants' cause; he was a strong supporter of the Plan of Campaign policy; and Mr. John Redmond was the first man to betray these evicted tenants."—*National Press*, 6th November, 1891.

Mr. M. Davitt, on Mr. T. Healy, M.P.

The following is an extract from a letter written by Michael Davitt to the *Melbourne Advocate*, of 26th December, 1891, in which Mr. Davitt gives his views of Mr. T. Healy's method of political controversy:—

"I grant that there is much, very much, provocation in the language which Mr. Tim Healy has employed in his attacks upon Mr. Parnell, while, in the filthy and infamous terms in which he referred to the dead leader's widow in Longford, and subsequently at a meeting of the National Federation in Dublin, there was enough of calculated insult to drive any of Mr. Parnell's followers to regretable lengths of retaliatory chastisement. No possible service can be rendered to the Home Rule cause by attacks upon a woman, no matter how much she may have tried to injure it. But when that woman is a widow bearing Mr. Parnell's name, it is nothing short of criminal folly for anyone desiring to see the split in the National movement healed up to apply the foulest word in the English language to one whose sex alone, apart from what should be the protecting shield of her dead husband's name, should save her from insult at the hands of any public man with Irish blood in his veins. I venture to assert that one hundred men could not be found among the twenty millions of the Celtic race to-day who would repeat or endorse such unmanly words towards the unfortunate, if culpable, woman whom Mr. Parnell made his wife."—*Irish Daily Independent*, 3rd February, 1892.

Parnellites on Anti-Parnellites.

Mr. P. O'Brien, M.P., on Mr. W. O'Brien, M.P.

Mr. Patrick O'Brien, M.P., at a Nationalist demonstration in Kilkenny, said:—

"Mr. Wm. O'Brien, M.P., had used language very little better than that used by that foul-mouthed individual Mr. Tim Healy. (Groans.)

"As to the rumours for peace, he repeated now what he said the other night that he would rather be linked with Carey and Corydon than linked in any movement with Tim Healy (applause), for he looked upon Healy as the greatest traitor that Ireland had seen for centuries. For his part he would make any sacrifice for his country, but he begged leave to be allowed to choose his own company, when it became a matter of associating with Tim Healy. (Applause.)"—*Independent*, 1st February, 1892.

Mr. T. Harrington, M.P., on Mr. T. P. O'Connor, M.P.

Mr. Harrington criticised T. P. O'Connor's speech in Glasgow, and said:—

"Mr. O'Connor's expression to him (Harrington) in Chicago was, 'My dear Harrington, don't you know if there are two bodies of men I hate most, it is the Irish priests and English Radicals.'

"It was on the other side (McCarthyite), were to be found every faddist, every self-seeker, every man who tried to lead a faction of his own. In everything constituting a party, however, they were a veritable house of cats."—*Freeman's Journal*, 18th November, 1891.

Mr. J. E. Redmond, M.P., on Mr. William O'Brien, M.P.

Mr. J. Redmond, speaking at the same meeting, said:—

"Mr. W. O'Brien pretended in a public speech to approve of the suggestion about Boulogne, and then proceeded to publish a one-sided, inaccurate and incomplete account of what happened."—*Freeman's Journal*, 18th November, 1891.

PARNELLITES ON ANTI-PARNELLITES.

LIARS.

Mr. Parnell at Sligo, 28th March. 1891 :—

"They are the very men who, when they expected anything from me, loaded me with fulsome adulation. (Hear, hear.) And whether are you to believe them when they loved or reverenced me, with every knowledge of my public and private life—whether can you believe them then or whether should you believe them now? I say that they were liars always and always remain so. (Cheers.) But they were just as much unworthy of credit when in the years gone by they exaggerated my good services to Ireland as they are to-day, when they seek to defame and destroy me. (Cheers.)"—*Freeman's Journal*, 30th March, 1891.

ROGUES WHO HAVE BEEN FOUND OUT.

Mr. Parnell at Enfield Railway Station, 15th March, 1891 :—

"Now, according to them (the McCarthyites), I was everything that was bad during all these years, and that they knew it according to them. If they knew it, what sort of men were they who supported me, and who said to the country that I was entitled to lead them? If they are not rogues to-day they must have been rogues then; and if they were not rogues then they must be rogues to-day. (Laughter.) But in my opinion they were always rouges. (Loud cheers.) A good many of them, anyhow; but their day has come, and they have been found out, and Ireland will not long put up with them. (Loud cheers.)"—*Freeman's Journal*, 16th March, 1891.

COULD NEVER BE TRUSTED.

Mr. J. J. O'Kelly, M.P., at Boyle, 24th February, 1891 :—

"He would not remain a member of that party for one moment if the interests of Ireland were to be handed over to such men. (Cheers.) Some of these men might be very good talkers, but they were utterly unfitted for the government of a Country—men who showed such a want of character, such a want of independence, and such a want of self-respect, and could never be trusted again. (Loud cheers.)" —*Freeman's Journal*, 25th February, 1891.

THEIR CHARACTERS WERE SO BAD.

Mr. T. Harrington, M.P., at Dublin, 28th July, 1891 :—

"Men who flung the first stone at their chief had characters for which they would not dare to challenge investigation; and he had seen men speaking from public platforms who knew that their characters were so bad that their only hope to hide their defects was to demonstrate their attachment to the priests. (Cheers.)"—*Freeman's Journal*, 29th July, 1891.

ANTI-PARNELLITES ON PARNELLITES.

THE THIRTY PHARISEES.

Mr. T. M. Healy, M.P., at Liverpool, 1st May, 1892 :—

"Among the thirty gentlemen—*the thirty Pharisees*, with Sir Joe M'Kenna their Head, down to Mr. Joseph Nolan—(hisses)—who kindly referred to us the other

day in London as vermin—among these thirty all the patriotism of all ages lies encrusted on their souls. . . . . They can give you, if you believe their own account of themselves, and as they say so it must be true, samples of any kind of Irish patriotism, ancient or modern, hillside, plainside, mountainside. (Cries of 'And offside.' Laughter.)"—*Freeman's Journal*, 2nd May, 1892.

TRAITORS AND PLEDGE BREAKERS.

Mr. Wm. O'Brien, M.P., at Kilkenny, 20th October, 1891 :—

"I tell them that if they are traitors in their hearts, thank God they have no longer the power of traitors to sell Ireland. (Cheers.) Sell Ireland ; no, the Irish Nation, thank God, is now strong enough to drag these traitors into the open light of day, and to baffle what I venture to characterise as one of the foulest conspiracies ever formed against our nation. (Cheers.)"—*Freeman's Journal*, October 21st, 1891.

Mr. T. M. Healy, M.P., at National Federation, 26th August, 1891 :—

"And I say as regards these gentlemen (the Parnellites), and I say it with regret, that as far as I am concerned I will do my best to put everyone of them out of Parliament—(Loud applause)—and I will be no more a party to any arrangement *with traitors or with pledge breakers.* (Renewed applause.)"—*National Press*, 27th August, 1891.

THEIR OATH NOT BELIEVED.

Mr. John Deasy, M.P., at Monaghan, 19th May, 1891 :—

"He (Mr. Deasy) *would not believe the oath of any of these men* as to their future action, because he believed the greater number of them were the mere creatures of the most unscrupulous man whom Ireland ever saw. These were the reasons why he considered there should not be any reconciliation."—*National Press*, 20th May, 1891.

DISORDERLY SCENES IN CORK.

The election campaign at Cork in June, 1892, opened with vigour. The Candidates are all in the field, Mr. W. O'Brien, M.P., and Mr. Maurice Healy, M.P., on the Anti-Parnellite side, and William Redmond, M.P., and Alderman Horgan, Mayor of Cork, on the side of the Parnellites. A number of disorderly and violent scenes have been reported between Parnellites and Anti-Parnellites. On Sunday morning, while Mr. W. O'Brien was at Mass in Brunswick-street Church, a crowd of Parnellites assembled outside the building and hissed the hon. gentleman as he came out. A number of Mr. O'Brien's friends surrounded a car on which he drove to the hotel. As they passed through the streets a few desultory rows occurred in which sticks were freely used. Outside the hotel further disturbance took place till the police interfered.

Mr. William Redmond, while canvassing in Blarney-street, yesterday morning, also encountered a hostile reception from the inhabitants of the locality, which at the last election appeared to be strongly Anti-Parnellite. In the afternoon the members of the Blackpool Anti-Parnellite Band were proceeding to a meeting addressed by Mr. William O'Brien when they were attacked by a large Parnellite crowd, armed with sticks and stones. *A free fight ensued.* A number of men on both sides were wounded, and ultimately the bandsmen were compelled to take

refuge in bye-streets. About 4 p.m. the Parnellites, mustering some 3,000 men, marched up Blarney-lane, accompanied by Mr. Redmond and the Mayor, the object of the demonstration being to assert the right of canvassing, if necessary by force. *The crowd behaved in a disorderly fashion, breaking windows and frightening the inhabitants of the quarter*, who sought shelter in their houses and locked the doors. In one case the inhabitants retaliated by throwing from the window articles of household furniture and various missiles on the crowd below, who in turn broke into the house and revenged themselves. A meeting was afterward held in Blarney-street, addressed by the Mayor and Mr. W. Redmond. *The Parnellites then proceeded to Blackpool-street, where they wrecked the rooms of the Blackpool Band* and smashed windows. The few Anti-Parnellites who put in an appearance were chased, and they could only retaliate by throwing stones from behind houses into the crowd.

The police who accompanied the demonstrators were not sufficiently powerful to cope with the disorder. During the evening a number of violent scenes occurred whenever the rival parties met in the streets. *Fifteen persons were treated at the North Infirmary* for injuries to the head of a more or less serious character. A large number of more trivial injuries were sustained by members of the crowds.—Addressing a largely-attended meeting in the city this evening Mr. O'Brien said that if they were attacked, or if their right to hold meetings in the City of Cork was violently questioned, they should defend themselves. — *Morning Post*, 27th June, 1892.

Appendix VIII.

IRELAND UNDER THE CONSERVATIVES.

FACT *v.* FICTION.

The history of Ireland during the last thirteen years affords the most extraordinary proof, on the one hand, of the evil that can be done to the Irish people by a weak and cowardly Government, and on the other of the benefits which a firm, impartial and kindly Government can confer upon the same people.

IRELAND UNDER LORD BEACONSFIELD.

When Lord Beaconsfield was defeated in April, 1880, and Mr. Gladstone came into office, Ireland was orderly and peaceful, as the following record of agrarian crime will prove. During the whole of the year 1879 (Lord Beaconsfield's last year of office) there were only 863 agrarian crimes in Irelend. In September and in October, 1879, Mr. Michael Davitt and others began their agitation and started the Land League, and crime immediately increased. He and his fellow conspirators were arrested by Lord Beaconsfield on November 19th, 1879, and from that moment agrarian crime began to fall again:—

1879. April	57	September	65	1880. January	114
May	76	October	110	February.	97
June	64	November	167	March	83
July	45	December	135	April	67
August	45				

Thus, during April, 1880, the last month of Lord Beaconsfield's office, Irish crime was at almost its lowest ebb; just as after the six years of Mr. Balfour's administration, Irish crime was again at a very low ebb. (Average, 455 crimes in 1891.)

Mr. Gladstone bore striking testimony to this, for, in a speech made by him on March 31st, 1880, at Edinburgh, he said—"There is an absence of crime and outrage, with a general sense of comfort and satisfaction, such as is unknown in the previous history of the country."

IRELAND UNDER Mr. GLADSTONE.

WHAT THEN HAPPENED?

In order to bribe the Irish rebel party and to please the English ultra-Radicals, Mr. Gladstone abandoned the moderate Peace Preservation Act in June, 1880. His administration of Ireland became careless and feeble. The magistrates and police were not supported. The outrage-mongers and murderers at once took heart. Terrorism and crime of every kind were practiced, and practiced with impunity; and in a very brief space Ireland became a regular pandemonium of outrage, mutilation and murder. The following figures will prove this. In April, 1880, the agrarian crimes were only 67. After June, 1880, when the abandonment of the Peace Preservation Act gave the reins to crime, they rose with frightful rapidity:—

1880	July	84	October	...	269
	August ...	103	November	...	561
	September	168	December	...	866

Thus the crimes committed in December, 1880, alone amounted to more than those of the whole year of 1879. The totals are for Mr. Gladstone's

Eight months of	1880	... ...	2,229
Twelve ,,	1881	... ...	4,439
,, ,,	1882	... ...	3,432

That is 10,100 crimes in two years and eight months.

In March, 1881, Mr. Gladstone passed his first Coercion Act, which, though very severe, proved ineffectual. Under it 1,200 persons were arrested and imprisoned without trial.

In July, 1882, after the horrible murder of Lord Frederick Cavendish and Mr. Burke, Mr. Gladstone passed his second

Coercion Act, which was the most drastic measure of coercion passed for many years in Ireland. It was infinitely more severe than the moderate Crimes Act of 1887, under which Mr. Balfour has administered Ireland with such amazing success.

Under Mr. Gladstone's Coercion Acts the Government were given the power of arresting and imprisoning suspected persons without any trial; the power of having capital cases tried by Special Commission without a jury; the right of entering private houses and searching at all hours; the right of arresting anyone on bare suspicion found on a highway one hour after sunset; also of arresting suspected strangers; and the right of arbitrarily seizing and confiscating all the copies of any newspaper.

It is true that Lord Spencer, by firmly administering Mr. Gladstone's second Coercion Act, caused crime to decrease, as the figures of agrarian crime show: 1883, 870; 1884, 762; 1885 (six months) 373. But Lord Spencer was as foully revilled then by the Irish Nationalists for doing his duty as Mr. Balfour has been since. Here are two examples:

"He (Lord Spencer) stopped at nothing; not at secret torture; not at subsidising red-handed murderers; not at knighting jury-packers; not at sheltering black official villany with a coat of darkness."—(*United Ireland*, leading article, June 13th, 1885.)

"Ireland is ruled by the worst Englishman (Lord Spencer) and the most sneaking Scotchman (Mr. Trevelyan) that ever crossed the Channel."—(Mr. W. O'Brien, at Carrick-on-Suir, September 7th, 1884.)

Once again Mr. Gladstone, for party purposes, dallied with crime in Ireland; and when, overwhelmed by his universal blundering and failures, he bolted from office in July, 1885, he let it be known that his party would not renew their Crimes Prevention Act.

The Act was not renewed. The inevitable result followed. Agitators and outrage-mongers once again grew bold, and crime increased. The judges declared that the law was practically powerless. The year 1886 (during nearly all the first seven months of which Mr. Gladstone was in office, and during the last five, Lord Salisbury) gave the following figures.—

First half-year, 584. Last half-year, 472. Total, 1,056.

There were also on June 30th, 1886, 866 persons wholly, and 4,035 persons partially boycotted.

IRELAND UNDER Mr. BALFOUR.

In 1887 Mr. Arthur Balfour became Irish Secretary, and passed his only Crimes Act, a much milder and less arbitrary measure than either of Mr. Gladstone's two Acts.

The result, combined with firm and just administration of the law, has been marvellous:—

	Agrarian Crimes.	Persons Boycotted.	Evictions.
1886	1,056	...	...
1887	883 ...	4,901 ...	3,869
1888	660 ...	702 ...	1,609
1889	535 ...	152 ...	1,356
1890	502 ...	472 ...	1,421
1891	455 ...	403 (May)	704

The increase in the number of boycotted persons in 1890 was almost wholly due to the Tipperary struggle; and, whereas in 1887 there were 866 persons wholly boycotted, in 1891 there were none wholly boycotted, and only 403 partially boycotted.

(N.B.—All the above statistics of crime include threatening letters and notices.)

The following figures point to a great rise in general prosperity:—

	Deposits and Balances in Joint Stock Banks.	Capital in Savings Banks.	Passengers on Railways.	Value of Good's Traffic.
1886 ...	£30,172,000	£2,703,000	18,640,000	£1,270,000
1890 ...	£33,325,000	£3,713,000	20,293,000	£1,369,000
1891 ...				
Increase:	£3,153,000	£1,010,000	1,653,000	£99,000

Average number of paupers in Irish workhouses. 1881-6 - 51,558
,, ,, ,, 1887-91 - 45,848

A decrease of 11 per cent. under the Unionist Government.

Number of Irish Emigrants ... ... 1881-5 ... 398,658
,, ,, ,, ... 1886-90 ... 335,817

A decrease of 16 per cent.

Agricultural progress—	1886.	1890.	Increase.
Horses ...	549,204	584,872	35,668
Cattle ...	4,183,924	4,240,316	56,392
Sheep ...	3,366,043	4,323,395	957,352
Pigs ...	1,263,142	1,570,366	307,224
Poultry ...	13,909,822	15,408,428	1,498,606

REMEDIAL LEGISLATION.

The only Act for the amelioration of the Irish people passed by Mr. Gladstone from 1880 to 1885 was his Land Act of 1881. This did not apply to leaseholders. It arbitrarily confiscated the owners' property, and set up that impracticable and fatal dual ownership, which has done such injury to the agrarian prosperity of Ireland.

Lord Salisbury's Government has passed the following measures:—

(1) The Ashbourne Acts, to enable the tenants to buy their holdings Under this 21,000 tenants have become owners.

(2) The Light Railways Act, to bring the remote and neglected districts in connection with the markets, and to give work to the needy peasantry. (This was bitterly obstructed by Mr. Healy, Dr. Tanner, and the English Radicals).

(3) Extensive relief works, to rescue the peasantry from the distress caused by the failure of the potato crop.

4) Plans have been prepared for draining the basins of the Bann, the Barrow and the Shannon, and would have become law but for Separatist obstruction.

(5) The inclusion of leaseholders (130,000) in the Land Act.

(6) The great Land Purchase Act of 1891, under which every Irish cultivator is enabled to purchase his land on most fair and easy terms, and without burden or practical cost to the British taxpayer.

Mr. Gladstone proposed, in 1886, a land purchase scheme, which proposed to give £50,000,000, and would ultimately have given £150,000,000 of British money to buy out the Irish landowners, entirely at the option of the landlord, and without any adequate safeguards.

Mr. Balfour got power to advance £33,000,000 (which may reach £99,000,000) to carry out his just and safe land purchase scheme of 1891, which requires the assent of both tenant and landowner. The whole sum of Mr. Balfour's loan is thoroughly secured upon, and guaranteed by, the property and taxes of the Irish people, for whose benefit the Act exists. *There is no burden or risk upon the British taxpayer.*

Mr. Balfour has also introduced a complete Local Government Bill for Ireland, which, after being ridiculed and denounced, passed its second reading in June, 1892, by the handsome majority of 92.

Since July, 1892, Mr. Gladstone and Mr. John Morley have formally withdrawn the Crimes Act, formally sanctioned the National League, released the Gweedore Murderers and two Dynamitards, issued an illegal circular refusing Police protection to Sheriff's Officers and appointed the ridiculous and unjust Mathew Commission to aid the Plan of Campaign tenants "who

can pay but who wont pay because Mr. Dillon tells them not to pay," and introduced a second Separation Bill for breaking up the United Kingdom. The result is already seen in growing crime and heroism throughout Ireland. Clare County is in a state of alarming disorder, and the evil contagion is rapidly spreading to other districts.

As Mr. Justice O'Brien said in his charge to the Grand Jury of Clare on Wednesday, Feb. 27th, 1893:—

"I must say that the picture that the returns made by the constabulary of the state of crime in the county present to my mind shows a state of *lawlessness exceeding in amount—far exceeding in amount—that which has come under your notice on mine in past time*, and destined, I fear, unless checked by some vigorous hand, to increase. The facts are all known to yourselves. You know *there is no security for life in this county*. You know that property is not secure any more than life; you know that a system of intimidation exists that is carried into all the relations of private and domestic life, carried into all the relations that arise out of trade and every kind of occupation, and unless some power intervenes of greater efficiency than mere statement or exposition, I cannot but foresee that the evil will go on increasing."

At the conclusion of the criminal business at Ennis on Thursday evening, March 2nd, Mr. Justice O'Brien made the following remarkable statement as to the Jurors:—

"I now consider it right to draw the attention of those who were charged with the maintenance of law and order and the preservation of life and property to the result of these legal proceedings, which show that *no kind of security any longer exists for property or for life*, so far as the same depends on the law, as it now exists in County Clare. Seven cases have been tried before me representing an infinitesimal part of the actual crime, but with the uniform result that the law has entirely failed to bring the offenders to justice, in spite of every means that vigilance, care, and zeal on the part of the police in trying to obtain that object. *Every kind of argument has been made use of to the jurors* to their sense of self-respect, to the common interests of the whole community, and to their sense of moral obligation, if such a thing remains, *but without the least results*."

Lord Spencer himself confessed in the House of Lords on *Friday, March 3rd*, 1893, that "Her Majesty's Government considers the condition of Clare most unsatisfactory, and the Irish Government will do their best to restore law and order to all Her Majesty's Government in that country," and so long as the reins are given to the outrage-mongers, crime in Ireland is certain to increase as it did in 1880, and in 1885 and 1886.

Let every honest man contrast the record of the two parties in Ireland. Let the electors of England note how peace, order, security, civil and religious liberty, better trade, higher wages, in a word, general prosperity, mark the Conservative and Unionist Administration.

Let the electors of England remember that a Gladstonian Government has meant crime and ruin for Ireland, and that Separation would mean civil war, carnage, persecution and ruin, and would drive hundreds of thousands of starving Irish into England and Scotland.—[N.U., 1892; No. 58.]

Appendix IX.

IRISH LAND PURCHASE.

Mr. GLADSTONE'S AND Mr. BALFOUR'S PLANS CONTRASTED.

All political parties have been pledged for many years to put an end, as far as possible, to the system of land tenure in Ireland, where both landlord and tenant have rights of ownership in the soil, which are constantly in conflict with each other and which have been made the excuse, in the hands of political agitators, for frequent disturbance, lawlessness, and outrage.

The remedy, accepted by all, is to enable the occupying tenants to purchase their holdings on easy terms by means of State aid.

Mr. Gladstone has several times brought forward plans of Land Purchase. In 1870 he inserted provisions in the Land Act to enable occupying tenants to purchase there holdings. In 1881 these facilities were further increased, and in 1884 his Government proposed to advance twenty millions for another scheme with the same object. His latest attempt, in 1886, was a proposal for compulsorily buying out the Irish landlords by advancing fifty millions of English money for the purpose, with the prospect of spending nearly one hundred and fifty millions in all before the object was attained. This Bill was described by Mr. Gladstone as affording to "the Irish landlord refuge and defence from a possible mode of government in Ireland, which he regards as fatal to him." It was an "inseparable" part, as Mr. Gladstone called it, of his Home Rule programme, and was dependent for its success upon an Irish Parliament controlled by Mr. Parnell, and composed of those whom the Special Commission described as having entered into "a conspiracy, by a system of coercion " and intimidation to promote an agrarian agitation against the " payment of agricultural rents, for the purpose of impoverishing " and expelling from the country the Irish landlords, who were " styled the English garrison."

The British people rejected this scheme, as they believed neither in the honesty of those who would have had to carry it out nor in the security which was offered.

Mr. Balfour, on behalf of the Unionist Government, passed a Bill on an entirely different basis, by which the tenants are enabled to purchase their holdings voluntary, and the advances for the purpose are limited to an amount of *which the repayment is absolutely secured out of Irish funds, and do not impose any risk on the British taxpayers.*

Those who opposed Mr. Gladstone's Bill have, with perfect consistency, supported the measure of Lord Salisbury's Government. The two plans are altogether different, both in method and execution, as the following comparison will show:—

1.—COMPULSION.

Mr. Gladstone's Bill was compulsory in its nature. If a landlord made up his mind to sell his land, the State was compelled to buy, and might re-let or re-sell the property as best it could.

Mr. Balfour's Act only comes into force when the landlord is willing to sell and the tenant is willing to buy. No one can be compelled to sell or buy against his will.

2.—THE PRICE.

Under Mr. Gladstone's Bill the price of the land to be sold was arbitrarily fixed at *twenty times the net rent* as it stood in 1885 (increased to twenty-two years in exceptional circumstances).

Under Mr. Balfour's Act the price is fixed by mutual and voluntary agreement, but must not under ordinary circumstances exceed £3,000 for any one holding. It also contains provisions which will chiefly benefit the smaller tenants.

3.—HOW THE PURCHASE MONEY IS RAISED.

Mr. Gladstone proposed that, in the first instance, fifty millions in 3 per cent. permanent annuities should be issued, but made no provisionfor any further issue, though he admitted it might be necessary.

Mr. Balfour's plan is to pay the landlords in guaranteed Stock, bearing interest at $2\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. Securities, as described below, are provided for the repayment of the interest on the purchase money, and the issue of the Stock is limited to the value of these guarantee funds capitalised at 4 per cent. This is estimated at thirty-three millions.

4.—HOW REPAID.

Mr. Gladstone proposed that the tenant should repay a sum equal to twenty times the gross rent, either at once or by forty-nine instalments, at the end of which time he would become the owner.

Under Mr. Balfour's Act the tenant pays off the instalments of the purchase money in forty-nine years, at the rate of 4 per cent. on the amount advanced. At the end of that time he will be the owner of the land. Thus, if the rent is, say, £100, and he agrees to give 17 years' purchase (the average under the Ashbourne

Acts), he will pay £68 pounds for forty-nine years, and own the land at the end of the term. If he buys at less than 17 years' purchase, he pays smaller instalments. (For the first five years he pays £80, in order to establish an insurance fund against bad times, and he has the option of continuing this payment, and so acquiring the freehold in less than 49 years.)

5.—THE SECURITIES.

Under Mr. Gladstone's Bill an Irish Parliament was to collect all the Irish taxes and duties, as well as the instalments from the tenants of purchased estates, and was to pay them over to a Receiver-General, appointed by the British Government, who would take out what was necessary to pay the interest on the advances, and hand over the balance (if any) to the Irish Government. This proposal was described by Mr. Parnell (April 16th, 1886), as "unnecessary, strange, and absurd," besides being offensive to the Irish people. In the face of such a declaration, the prospect of an Irish Parliament collecting his rents for the Receiver-General may be easily estimated. Beyond this there was no security for the repayment of the purchase money.

Mr. Balfour's plan, on the other hand, provides numerous solid securities for the repayment, by which any risk of loss to the British taxpayer is absolutely guarded against. There is, in fact, no possibility of the British exchequer suffering, since every penny advanced is secured on sums paid by England to Ireland, and which need not be paid if the purchasers do not keep faith. On the other hand, the Irish people will not suffer by the establishment of these guarantees, since they will not be resorted to except in the event of organised repudiation, of which experience shows that there is little probability.

The securities to safeguard the British taxpayer are as follows:—

1.—In the first place, one-fifth of the purchase money is kept in hand until the tenants have repaid substantial instalments. This provision has proved quite successful under the Ashbourne Acts.

2.—Next, the Exchequer contributions of £40,000 a year are to be kept in hand for five years, producing £200,000 nett out of which any default in the payment of interest may be made good.

3.—Power is also taken, in case of such default, to withhold the Irish portion of the probate duty subvention, and other local grants, and to raise a special tax. (All these together amount to £330,000 a year.) There would be no hardship in withholding the probate duty, since it is a new grant, not heretofore enjoyed in Ireland, but given by Lord Salisbury's Government as part of their Local Government scheme in 1889.

4.—If the above should be insufficient, the Government has power to withhold other Imperial grants for local purposes, to the amount of over a million per annum.

5.—Finally, the tenant-right can be sold, and the land itself in the last resort.

Experience under the Ashbourne Acts has shown that the instalments of purchase money have been paid by the new owners with remarkable punctuality, and that out of nearly £10,000,000 advanced, only a few hundred pounds of the repayments are in arrear.

6.—THE CONGESTED DISTRICTS.

The congested Districts are those where the holdings are so small and the land is so poor that the tenants are always on the verge of starvation. They have always been the great difficulty of Irish government.

Mr. Gladstone's Bill would have done little to relieve them. Beyond enabling the State to buy up the properties and consolidate them, he had no plan of relief to propose.

Mr. Balfour's Act sets up a special board for dealing with these districts. It gives them power, with an income of £40,000 a year, derived from the Irish Church surplus, to amalgamate holdings which are too small to support a tenant in comfort; to assist poor tenants to migrate to more fertile parts, or to emigrate; to sell seed potatoes at cost price; to improve the fisheries; teach fish-curing and stock raising; and carry out other plans for the benefit of the poorest inhabitants.

The Board will also be a trustworthy and responsible medium for the administration of private charity, which has already done much to improve the condition of the inhabitants.

It will thus be seen that the plan of Land Purchase devised by the Unionist Government was at once practical and self-supporting, and being combined with proposals for the benefit of the poorest tenants, was a measure of remedial legislation deserving the support of all parties.—[C.C.O. No. 25].

APPENDIX X.

DEEDS, NOT WORDS.

What the Conservative and Unionist Government have done for the People.

The following are some of the Measures carried by the Government of LORD SALISBURY since they came into office in 1886:—

I.—MEASURES DIRECTLY AFFECTING THE WORKING CLASSES.

Coal Mines Regulation Act, 1887, restricting employment of children and providing increased safety for the miners by enforcing the best methods of ventilation, and the use of the least dangerous explosives known to science. This Act has already had the effect of greatly reducing the loss of life in mines.

Friendly Societies Act, 1887, to effect improvements in the administration of society funds.

Superannuation Act, 1887, to give gratuities to workmen and others when discharged from the public service, and to safeguard the savings of the working classes.

Labourers' Allotments Acts, 1887 & 1890. to enable the agricultural labourers to obtain land for allotments on fair and easy terms, and giving compulsory powers to County Councils to enforce the granting of allotments, where required. Since 1886 the number of allotments has increased by over 100,000.

Merchandise Marks Acts, 1889 & 1891, which prevents foreign-made goods from being marked and sold as English made, and which thereby greatly benefits English labour.

Merchant Shipping Acts, 1888 & 1889, to enforce the use of the best life-saving apparatus on sea-going ships, and confer other benefits on sailors.

Patents, Designs, and Trade Marks Act, to amend the Act of 1883 by simplifying procedure, and protecting inventors against fraud.

Sea Fisheries Act, 1888, establishing local tribunals for settling disputes, fixing close times, and generally regulating the fishery industry.

Regulation of Railways Act, 1889, to promote public safety by compelling the adoption of the block system, efficient brakes, &c.

Weights and Measures Act, 1889, to protect the poor against fraud in the purchase of their daily necessaries.

Technical Instruction Acts, 1887 & 1889, to enable the local authorities to establish and support schools for manual and technical instruction in England and Ireland. Large sums of money have been provided out of the Public Exchequer for this purpose.

Infectious Diseases Act 1890, to protect the public against danger by enforcing the notification of any outbreak of disease.

Local Government Acts, 1888 & 1889, establishing an elective and popular system of County Government in England and Wales and Scotland.

Board of Agriculture Act, 1889, to establish a Department for all agricultural business, with powers to conduct experiments, assist technical schools, and generally to promote the interests of the greatest of British industries.

Housing of the Working Classes Act, 1890, consolidating and simplifying all previous Acts. It extended these powers for the first time to rural authorities, and greatly strengthened the powers of County Councils and other local authorities to render habitable or to pull down (at owner's expense) dwellings unfit for habitation, &c., &c.

Education Code Act, 1890, which provides a more liberal fixed grant, abolishes "payment by results," gives new aid to voluntary schools, and develops instruction in practical subjects (such as cookery), and provides for the moral and physical aspects of education.

Police Acts, 1890, securing liberal pensions for policemen in Great Britain.

Factories and Workshops Act, 1891, restricting the employment of women after child-birth, raising the entrance age of half-timers to eleven years, providing additional precautions against fire, improving the healthiness of workshops, checking the sweating system, and enlarging the powers of inspectors.

Companies Acts, 1890, to strengthen the law against fraudulent promoters.

London Public Health Act, 1891, consolidating the law, providing for the suppression of nuisances, for increasing sanitary precautions and safeguards, and for the enforcement of the law by public authorities.

Free Education, 1891. It gives an extra grant of 10s. per head to all schools which claim it, which enables every child to obtain education without a charge, thus conferring a great boon on the poorer classes, and practically abolishing school fees.

2.—IRELAND.

Criminal Law Amendment Act, 1887, to repress crime and to release the Irish tenantry from the tyranny of the National League. As the result of this Act the number of boycotted persons has fallen from 4,901 in June, 1887, to 403 in May, 1891; and agrarian outrages have fallen from 1,056 in 1886 to 502 in 1890.

Irish Land Act, 1887, admitting 130,000 leaseholders to the benefit of the Land Court.

Light Railways (Ireland) Acts, 1889 and 1890, for making cheap and easy communications with poor and remote parts of Ireland.

Land Purchase and Congested Districts Bill, 1891, a great scheme for enabling the tenants in Ireland to purchase their holdings on very easy terms, and without burden to the British taxpayer. It also established a non-political board, to relieve and develop the congested districts, and endowed it with £40,000 per annum for these objects.

An Irish Local Government Bill was introduced in 1892, and passed the second reading.

3.—THE NAVY.

The Naval Defence Act, 1889, providing for the addition of 70 ships to the strength of the Navy, so as to secure that the British Navy shall be equal to those of any two other powers.

Fourteen new ships of war in 1887-88 were completed for sea, 29 in 1888-89, 32 in 1889-90, and 16 in 1890-91, besides providing for the construction of 57 vessels during the next two years.

Imperial Defence Act, 1888, assuring the defence of ports and coaling stations, and providing a powerful squadron of war ships for the defence of Australia.

4.—THE ARMY.

National Defence Act, 1888, to facilitate the mobilisation of the forces in the event of threatened danger.

A complete scheme has been adopted for the defence of London, and the necessary positions have been acquired.

Re-arrangement of the defences of our ports at Lome and re-armament.

Establishment of proper financial control over manufacturing departments.

Additional grants have been made to volunteer forces, volunteer brigades have been created, and 12 new batteries of artillery have been armed.

Fortification and armament of coaling stations and military forts.

Complete inspection of all arms in the hands of troops.

Healthy homes secured for soldiers by Act authorising the building of new barracks at an estimated cost of four millions.

5.—FINANCE.

The National Debt decreased	£33,518,000
The Income Tax reduced by an annual amount of	4,000,000
Tobacco Duty reduced by an annual amount of	500,000
Duties on Tea and Curran's reduced by an annual amount of ...	1,200,000
Inhabited House Duty reduced by an annual amount of	570,000
Local Rates reduced by an annual additional contribution estimated at	3,873,000

INCREASE OF TRADE.

Exports and Imports have increased in 1890 as compared with 1886 by 130,000,000

Shipping Returns for 1890 show an increase over 1886 on the cargo traffic of ... ... 9,046,000 tons

Capital in Post Office Savings Banks has increased in four years nearly £17,000,000

N.B.—A complete Irish Local Government Bill and a valuable Small Holdings Bill have been introduced by the Conservative Government into Parliament during the present Session (1892).

Judge for yourselves whether a Government that can show such a record of useful work is not worthy the confidence of their fellow countrymen.

[N.U., No. 77.]

Appendix XI.

MR. GLADSTONE'S BROKEN PROMISES AND LORD SALISBURY'S PERFORMANCES.

Mr. Gladstone's programme, as expounded before he came into office in 1880, and in the Queen's Speeches between 1880 and 1885, included 37 subjects of legislation, many of which were described as of urgent importance. Every one of these remained unaccomplished when he left office in 1886. The list is as follows:—

*1. Local Government for England and Wales.
2. County Government for Ireland.
*3. Reduction of National Expenditure.
*4. Extension of Irish Land Purchase.
*5. Conversion of the National Debt.
*6. Local Government for London.
*7. Relief of Local Taxation.
8. Intoxicating Liquors Licensing Laws.

*9. Scottish Private Bill Legislation.
*10. Improvement of the Education Acts.
11. Repeal of the Opium Tax in India.
*12. Law of Local Loans.
13. Reform of the City Companies.
*14. Abolition of the Silver Plate Duty.
15. Rivers Conservancy and Floods Prevention.
*16. Settlement of the Suez Canal Question.
17. Reform of the London Corporation.
18. Law of Settlement and Entail.
19. Establishment of a Criminal Code.
*20. Welsh Intermediate Education.
*21. Police Pensions (England).
*22. Police Organisation and Pensions (Scotland).
*23. Scottish University Reform.
*24. Indian Financial Reform.
*25. Irish University Question.
26. Law of the Medical Profession.
*27. Re-organisation of Revenue Departments.
*28. Home Government of India, Reform of.
29. Law of Banking.
*30. Improvement of the Currency.
31. Valuation of Property.
*32. Establishment of Sixpenny Telegrams.
33. Establishment of Court of Criminal Appeal.
34. Public Payment of Election Expenses.
35. Commercial Treaty with France.
*36. Law of Charities and Mortmain.
*37. Vaccination Law.

* All these questions marked thus * were dealt with thoroughly and successfully under Lord Salisbury's Government.

[C.C.O., No. 43.]

Appendix XII.

FREE EDUCATION.

Among the many boons that the Conservative and Unionist Government have conferred upon the working classes, there is none greater or more practical than that of Free Education.

Lord Salisbury and his colleagues have, by their Allotment Acts, Mines Acts, Factory and Workshop Acts, Merchandise Marks Act, Local Government Act, Railway Rates Act, as well as by their Irish Land and Relief Acts, benefited every kind of labour.

By the Free Education Act of 1891, no less than £2,500,000 a year of public money is devoted to the great object of relieving the Working Classes from the payment of School Fees for their children.

It is just that the State, which compels parents to send their children to school, should provide that education for them without charge. It is for the good of the country that its children should be educated.

Notwithstanding innumerable promises and the many boasts of the Gladstonian and Radical Party, they never tried to establish Free Education.

Notwithstanding the fact that the Gladstonians have been in office for the greater part of the last 60 years. it was not till the Conservatives came into power that the working men obtained Free Education.

What does this boon mean to working men?

It means to a parent who has six children at a school charging a 3d. fee, a saving of 1s. 6d. a week. It means to a parent who has six children at a school charging a 2d. fee, a saving of 1s. a week. It means to a parent who has six children at a school charging a 1d. fee, a saving of 6d. a week.

In every case it is a valuable boon to labouring families, especially to the agricultural labourers, whose wages are often scanty and inadequate.

Let not working men be misled by the attacks of the Radical Party upon Voluntary Schools. In Voluntary Schools religion and morality are taught. In Board Schools religious teaching may be forbidden, and no Church or Nonconformist Catechisms can be used. Board Schools have to be maintained mainly at the expense of the ratepayers, and are often a very heavy burden upon them.

In Voluntary Schools, 2,260,559 children are annually educated at a cost of £1 16s. 4½d. each. In Board Schools, 1,457,358 children are annually educated at a cost of £2 4s. 6½d. each. So that Board Schools cost 8s 2d. for each child more than Voluntary Schools.

A great part of the cost of Board Schools falls on the ratepayers, £1,320,487 every year; whereas Voluntary Schools cost the ratepayers nothing, as the voluntary subscriptions to them amount to nearly £1,000,000 a year.

Moreover, if Voluntary Schools were replaced by Board Schools, it would cost the ratepayers and taxpayers at least £40,000,000 to build and provide the same accommodation as the Voluntary Schools now provide for 3,624,103 children. This would be a wanton, injurious, and unnecessary extravagance.

It would also cost the ratepayers over £2.000,000 a year to educate in Board Schools the children that are now educated in Voluntary Schools without any cost to the ratepayers.

Can then the working men of Britain hesitate to support the Ministry that has given them Free Education and Technical Instruction, and that save the country from the ruinous expense of Board Schools, viz.:—Over £40,000,000 in capital expenditure. and over £2.000,000 in yearly rates.

Appendix XIII.

THE MERCHANDISE MARKS ACTS, 1887 & 1891.

FRAUDULENT FOREIGN IMPORTATIONS STOPPED.

These are among the most important measures passed for the benefit of the people, manufacturers, artisans, and consumers alike.

Before 1887 unscrupulous traders used to palm off upon an unsuspecting public inferior wares of foreign manufacture, labelled or impressed with names of British makers, or of places in the United Kingdom, or with well-known British trade marks.

These practices injured three classes, viz.:—

(1) The general consumer, who was not getting what he wanted to buy, and
(2) The British merchants or manufacturers who were owners of the trade marks so misappropriated.
(3) The workmen in the various British factories and workshops in which these goods were falsely represented as having been made.

The Merchandise Marks Acts have put a stop to these practices. No man can any longer with impunity place upon goods false trade marks or false names and descriptions.

Moreover, by section 16 of the Merchandise Marks Act of 1887, all foreign goods coming into this country, and bearing upon them any names or marks indicating British origin *will be stopped by the Customs* and not allowed to be landed, unless there is also placed upon such goods a definite indication of the country where they were produced.

This provision is specially valuable to the wage-earning classes of the country. On the one hand, and regarding them as consumers, they will be able for the future to buy goods, and to know that the marks are genuine. For if goods are not marked at all, there will be great suspicion that they are of foreign origin, while if they have actually been imported into this country from abroad, bearing any British names or marks, there will be also a plain and definite indication that they are foreign upon the face of them.

The working man engaged in manufacturing pursuits is still more greatly benefited. Before the passing of these Acts he had to submit to having his employment stolen from him, the bringing of foreign goods into this country under the guise of British goods, and the selling of them in the country as British.

Now, however, the working man will be permitted to reap the fruits of his industry, relieved from this unfair practice, for foreign goods will either have to come into this country not marked at all, when, as has been pointed out, they will be immediately under suspicion; or they will have to bear a definite indication of the foreign country from whence they came.

Ample protection is given to a workman who applies a mark forbidden by these Acts by the authority and under the instructions of his master, the master alone being subject to the penalties in such a case.

Prosecutions may, under the Act of 1891, be conducted by the Board of Trade *at the public expense*, in cases affecting the general interests of the country, or of a section of the community, or of

a trade. Two important prosecutions have since been successfully carried through by the Board of Trade officers, one at Bristol in a case where American lard was labelled as British, and the other at Sheffield where machine-cut files had been stamped as hand-cut.

The Acts are conceived in the interests of the producing classes of the country, and will be recognised by them as being of the greatest possible value.

NOTE.—On July 30th, 1890, a Select Committee of the House of Commons reported that "Your Committee have examined many witnesses representing various trades, the shipping industry, members of chambers of commerce, officials from the Customs department, and others. As a result, there seems to be a consensus of opinion, *that the Merchandise Marks Act, 1887, has generally been* most beneficial *to the manufacturing interest of the country, and that the importation of fraudulently marked goods, or of goods bearing a false indication of origin, has* materially diminished *since the Act came into operation."*

Evidence was given that during the financial year ending 31st March, 1890, there had been no less than 7,792 *stoppages of goods, including* 118,605 *entire packages and* 28,132 *other forms of goods. In* 4,800 *of these cases the goods were delivered as imported, in* 2,220 *the marks on the goods were obliterated or altered without the imposition of a fine, in* 592 *cases a fine was imposed, and in* 372 *cases the goods were seized. The articles detained included groceries, hosiery, agricultural produce, toys, stationery, metals and many other things, coming from 33 different countries.*

The total number of detentions (including those in the parcels post), for the years ending 31st March 1889, 1890, and 1891, is returned by the Commissioners of Customs at 22,286. *The numbers for 1891 show a decrease to* 6,110 *cases, with reference to which the Commissioners say "this decrease in the number of instances in which illegal or fraudulent marking of goods has been detected by our officers, taken in connection with the increasing volume of trade, points to a considerable improvement in the manner of marking foreign goods brought to this country."*—[N.U. No. 98.]

Appendix XIV.

EGYPT UNDER GLADSTONE AND SALISBURY.

Just as the peaceful and prosperous condition of Ireland under the Conservative and Unionist Government afforded the most vivid contrast to its disorderly and crime-ridden state under Mr. Gladstone, so did the present condition of Egypt, after six years of Lord Salisbury's influence and guidance, offer the most gratifying contrast to its disturbed and wretched condition during Mr. Gladstone's period of office.

EGYPT UNDER LORD BEACONSFIELD.

Egypt, like Ireland, was, under Lord Beaconsfield, orderly and progressing. The purchase of the Suez Canal shares by

Lord Beaconsfield in 1875 saved Egyptian finance from bankruptcy, and secured for England, at a price of only £4,076,000 a splendid property, worth now over £18,000,000. This has given us a commanding influence over the Suez Canal, the annual traffic through which in 1890 was 3,400 vessels, of 6,900,000 nett tonnage, of which 2,500 were British, of 5 330,000 tonnage. The percentage of British vessels was, in 1890, 74·4, and of British tonnage 77·3 Out of the profits on this far-sighted purchase our seaports and coaling stations were lately fortified by Lord Salisbury's Government, without any cost to the British Taxpayer. Already since 1875 over £1,000,000 of the £4,000,000 has been paid off by the interest and sinking fund assigned by the Khedive. In 1894 the shares owned by the British nation will become entitled to their proportion of the full dividend earned by the Suez Canal Company. This was, in 1891, 20 per cent. So that ere many years are past the cost of the Canal shares will have been paid off out of their own profits; and the English nation will then have acquired for absolutely nothing a property which will be worth at least £18,000,000 in 1894, together with all the future financial profit and political influence connected with them.

Mr. Goschen's scheme of financial control in 1877 completed the salvation of Egyptian credit; and when Mr. Gladstone took office in 1880, Egypt was orderly and prosperous. The value of Egyptian stock, which in 1882 and 1884 fell to 48 and 56 respectively, in consequence of Mr. Gladstone's blundering, is now 98: and this notwithstanding the reduction of interest from 5 to 4 per cent.!

MR. GLADSTONE IN EGYPT.

The beginning of the military revolt, arising out of the soldiers' grievances and of Arabi's conspiracy, were, as usual, quite neglected by Mr. Gladstone's Government. On January 8th, 1882, Mr. Gladstone and Sir Charles Dilke, acting under the adroit instigation of M. Gambetta, sent the notorious Anglo-French Joint Note to the Khedive. This was in defiance of the Sultan's suzerainty, and of the so-called European Concert. It set every other interest—Turkey, Egypt, Germany, Austria and Italy, against us. Trusting in their new French allies, Mr. Gladstone's Government at last sent the British Fleet to Alexandria in May, 1882. The French promptly deserted Mr. Gladstone, and their fleet sailed away, leaving him in the lurch.

Then came weeks of vacillation and inaptitude, during which riots took place, and British subjects were plundered and murdered. Owing to want of military precautions, the bombardment of Alexandria was followed by the burning and plunder of that

great commercial port. This cost Egypt £4,000,000. British troops were then sent to Egypt. Tel-el-Kebir was fought; Arabi was overthrown, and Cairo occupied. This expedition cost £3,900,000.

Mr. Gladstone then disbanded the Egyptian army and left the Egyptian garrisons and residents in the Soudan, consisting of some 24,000 scattered troops and 40,000 natives, helpless before the Mahdi's fanatics. In November, 1883, Hicks Pasha, in spite of the urgent prayers for some good guns and a few British Officers, that he addressed to the British Government, then occupying Egypt, was allowed by them to go on his desperate march from Khartoum to Kordofan. That gallant officer and his whole army of 11,000 men were massacred.

The garrisons of Tokar and Singat were allowed slowly to starve to death within gun-sound of the British Fleet. Baker Pasha was permitted by Mr. Gladstone's Government to attempt the relief of Singat with a wholly inadequate force of raw Egyptian conscripts who had been driven in chains from their homes to certain death. The result was the butchery of Baker's army of 3,500 men, in February, 1884, and shortly after, the massacre of the brave Tewfik Bey and the garrison of Singat, within 26 miles of the British men of war.

GORDON'S ABANDONMENT.

About the same time, Mr. Gladstone, at length partially aroused, sent General Gordon to Khartoum, without men or money or definite instructions. Every request made by that gallant gentleman was refused by the British Government. In vain did Gordon ask for 200 Indian troops at Wadi Halfa, for a few squadrons of Turkish Cavalry, for Zebehr, or for half-a-dozen British Officers to stiffen his native soldiers.

From Khartoum Gordon wrote on April 16th, 1884: "I "shall hold on here as long as I can . . . and leave to you "the indelible disgrace of abandoning the garrisons of Senaar, "Kassala, Berber and Dongola." When at length an attempt to relieve Khartoum was forced upon Mr. Gladstone by public opinion, the expedition was delayed by him till too late. Gordon neglected, abandoned, betrayed, was killed on January 26th, 1885, and the streets of Khartoum ran red with the blood of 12,000 men, women and children, whom he had sacrificed his life to protect, but in vain. Five thousand more wretched victims had been previously massacred at Berber, and many at El Obeid, Bara, Kassala, and other places.

The cost of General Graham's first expedition to Suakin, in the spring of 1884, was £281,000; besides over 400 British

(killed and wounded) and 6,000 Arab lives. General Graham fought the bloody battles of El Teb and Tamai, and was then recalled by Mr. Gladstone just when he might have saved Khartoum and Gordon by sending a force on to Berber.

The cost of Lord Wolseley's tedious and difficult expedition up the Nile, in the autumn of 1884, to relieve Khartoum, which was sent too late, was about £1,600,000 altogether, besides involving the loss of some 300 British and the death of 6,000 Arabs. Lord Wolseley's army was recalled when just within reach of Khartoum.

The cost of General Graham's second expedition to Suakin, in March, 1885, which only advanced some 12 miles from the sea and was then brought back in hot haste, after fighting several bloody engagements, was about £1,000,000; besides a loss of about 200 British (killed and wounded) and of some 3,000 Arabs. The Suakin and Berber railway was partly laid at great cost, and then abandoned.

The appalling consequences of Mr. Gladstone's feebleness, delay and criminal blunders in Egypt were as follows :—

	Egyptian and Soudanese.	British Soldiers and Officers.
LIFE.	At least 80,000 persons cruelly slain.	Over 1,800 killed and wounded; exclusive of Several thousands invalided home from fever and sickness, many of whom have since died.
Treasure.	Egyptian £10,000,000	About £7,000,000.

EGYPT UNDER LORD SALISBURY.

Year by year and month by month the condition of Egypt improved, after 1886, till it became most prosperous.

The Egyptian finances show a considerable surplus (that for 1891 was £1,100,000) instead of a heavy deficit. Egyptian stocks, which in 1884, under Mr. Gladstone, stood as low as 56, now stand at over 98.

The Egyptian peasantry have been relieved from the burden of the corvee, or forced labour; and from the kourbash, or flogging, for arrears of their taxes. Their taxation has been generally reduced, and this year the salt tax has been lowered.

The irrigation works have been completed, to the great advantage of Egyptian agriculture. The peasantry, who were formerly obliged to wait for their water till the richer landowners had been satisfied, now have equal rights. The administration of justice, which used to be most uncertain, and to favour the rich

and oppress the poor, has been made fair and impartial. The frontiers have been protected from the Mahdi and his barbarous fanatics. The Egyptian army has been so re-organized and improved that the native soldiers were able, at Suakin, in 1889, to thoroughly defeat the Mahdists without the aid of British troops.

There have been no sanguinary and costly campaigns, begun too late and ended too soon; no destruction of cities and cruel massacres of many thousands; no rioting and tumults. The Egyptian people, under the prudent policy of Lord Salisbury, and under the steadying and beneficent influence of British administrators and British troops, are enjoying—especially the fellaheen, or labouring classes—an amount of prosperity, freedom, justice and happiness without parallel in their history.

But Mr. Gladstone, speaking at Newcastle on Oct. 2nd, 1891, denounced the British occupation of Egypt, which has conferred all these benefits upon Egypt and her people, and advocated a policy of evacuation, which would undoubtedly hand Egypt over to the Mahdi and anarchy, or to our French rivals.

Will Englishmen consent to abandon the splendid results achieved by their gallant soldiers and skilful administrators, and once again expose Egypt to all the horrors of carnage and ruin, which she suffered under Gladstonian mismanagement?—[N.U., No. 64.] This much was published in July, 1892.

It is a remarkable but not unexpected occurrence that Mr. Gladstone should not have been in power for six months before troubles of the gravest kind arose in Egypt. On this occasion it was not Mr. Gladstone's ministerial acts, but his pre-ministerial declarations which caused the difficulty. Speaking in Midlothian last July, Mr. Gladstone distinctly foreshadowed the early evacuation of Egypt as part of the Radical programme, and Mr. John Morley took the same line even more forcibly. Mr. Gladstone then spoke of "that burdensome and embarrassing occupation of Egypt, which, so long as it lasts, must be a cause of weakness and a source of embarrassment." These declarations were of course noted and made the most of abroad. France and Russia have active and eager representatives in Cairo, ready to make the most of every opening, and to lose no opportunity of weakening and, if possible, of destroying British influence.

Our enemies in Egypt artfully worked upon the *amour propre* and the ambition of the youthful Khedive, who, no doubt, frets at the controlling hand which British influence, British agents, and British administrators hold over his youthful masterfulness and youthful extravagance. They persuaded the young Khedive Abbas, only eighteen years of age, that he had little to hope for

from England, as the English troops were soon to be withdrawn, and as Mr. Gladstone is notoriously given up to leaving those who rely on him in the lurch; but that if he would only get rid of English influence at once, he might rely on France and Russia giving him a free rein in the government of his subjects.

The young prince lent himself too readily to these artful suggestions. Without rhyme or reason, and without notice, he suddenly dismissed the tried and honest Prime Minister, Mustapha Pasha Fehmy, as well as Abdurahman Pasha and Fouad Pasha, and replaced them by a notorious anti-progressive and pro-French Premier, in the person of Fakhri Pasha.

The real gravity of the Egyptian crisis consisted in the attitude of France and Russia. The *Daily News*, the official organ of the Gladstonian party, asserted on January 18th that the ambassadors of France and Russia had spontaneously called on Lord Rosebery to repudiate all sympathy with, or responsibility for, the sudden action of Abbas. The exact reverse was the truth. On January 17th M. Waddington and M. de Staël did call at the Foreign Office, but their mission was hostile and not friendly. The French Ambassador was instructed to protest against all interference with the Khedive's choice of his Ministers, and against Lord Cromer's attempt to control the policy of the Egyptian Government.

The Russian Ambassador followed close on M. Waddington's heels, and endorsed his protest. This conclusively proved the real source and origin of the young Khedive's sudden and injurious action. Fortunately in England the Foreign Office had a man at the helm. Lord Rosebery grasped the situation instantly. He succeeded in getting a Cabinet Council within an hour. Mr. Gladstone hesitated, wavered and tried to procrastinate; but Lord Rosebery was firm, and threatened instant resignation unless Lord Cromer was strongly supported. Finally, after over two hours' argument, a kind of compromise was come to. This was proved by a reply of M. Develle, French Minister for Foreign Affairs, to an interpellation. M. Develle said:—

"The Khedive, making use of the right which belongs to him, and has never been disputed, considered it his duty to dispense with the services of his first Minister, Fehmy Pasha, and entrusted the portfolio of the interior to Fakhri Pasha. He is understood to have reversed this decision in consequence of the intervention of Lord Cromer. As soon as I received this news, this very morning, I begged M. Waddington to call upon Lord Rosebery. Anything that may strike a blow at the rights of the Khedive, or the situation established in Egypt by treaties, cannot be a matter of indifference either to the French Government or to Europe itself."

Under the pressure of Lord Cromer, the British representative at Cairo, this appointment was withdrawn, and a compromise was effected, by which Riez Pasha became Prime Minister. The

greatest alarm was felt in Egypt. The Mahomedan populace was stirred up against British control. The native press, in the pay of the French and Russian agents, incited the people against England.

All this is the outcome of Mr. Gladstone's rash statements in Newcastle before he came into office. The result has been that Mr. Gladstone's Ministry has been obliged already to increase the British garrison in Egypt by over 3,000 men. That is, instead of evacuating Egypt, Mr. Gladstone has already had to double the British troops in that country.

APPENDIX XV.

LORD SALISBURY ON ULSTER.

In his great speech at Hastings on the 18th of May, 1892, Lord Salisbury said:—

ULSTER AND HOME RULE.

I have spoken to you about the effect of the proposed Irish legislation upon the people of this country. I cannot conclude without a word upon its effect upon some portion of the inhabitants of the island who will be immediately submitted to it. On a late occasion I ventured to bring forward, in earnest language, the grievances of the Ulster people. (Cheers.) I had no notion that I was treading upon so tender a corn. (Laughter.) I have produced an amount of wrath which indicates the sensitiveness of the conscience I have touched. (Laughter and cheers.) But those who suggest that I have evoked, or have appealed to, or have encouraged the danger against which I ventured to warn the country, are as foolish as if they should say that a seaman in one of your ships here, who was employed on *the look-out, and who called out "Breakers ahead," was to blame as the creator of the reefs upon which the ship was rushing.* (Laughter and cheers.) The danger lies across their path. They refuse to see it, and it will require something much more solid and substantial to dispose of it than the jokes of Sir William Harcourt or the imprecations of Lord Rosebery. (Cheers.) These great persons seem to me to want imagination. They cannot put themselves in the position of Ulstermen, who see the whole of their future life compromised and endangered. They cannot understand the horror with which these men see again the spectre arising which so often in the course of their history has been an omen of desolation, and sorrow, and murder to themselves. They deceived themselves with a metaphor which is very well in ordinary writing and talking, but is a mere metaphor, a word which we so frequently use—self-government.

We have self-government in this island because on great matters we are all agreed, and on small matters the preponderance changes from decade to decade. But self-government in a community divided to its base, divided by the feelings which most interest humanity, divided by the recollections of many a sore and sad and bitter tradition, divided by religion, divided by race—self-government in such a community is a simple mockery. (Cheers.) *It is absurd to call it self-government if Ulster is governed by Connaught, Leinster and Munster.* Is that self-government? Is it self-government if Belfast is governed by Limerick and Cork; Is that self-government? It is a mere mockery to use such words. People have allowed themselves to be led away by a superficial metaphor, and they refuse sympathy to the deep human feeling of apprehension which the announcement of that policy naturally calls forth.

Sir W. Harcourt talks of ascendency. He tell us that the passions to which we appeal are the passions of mere ascendency. I do not know whether he ever read the appeal of the non-episcopal ministers of Ireland to their Nonconformist brethren in England. If it were safe to promise anything with respect to Sir William Harcourt (laughter), I should imagine that he would not impute ascendency to these men. Allow me to read to you, because it is one the most important documents of our time, the address which the non-episcopal ministers of Ireland have drawn up for their co-religionists with respect to this great issue. They, at least, have never had ascendency, and have never been accused of aiming at it. They say, in this address :—

"Almost every one of the 990 non-Episcopal ministers in Ireland is opposed to Mr. Gladstone's scheme, or any other scheme which would establish a Parliament in Dublin possessing legislative and executive authority. The events which have occurred in Ireland since 1886, have strengthened us and the churches of which we are ministers in our determined opposition to a Dublin Parliament. The recent struggles between the Parnellites and the M'Carthyites have impressed us more strongly than ever with the tremendous influence exercised by the Irish priesthood—an influence which would be paramount in a Dublin Parliament. The effects of such clerical interference in the sphere of politics in other countries confirm us in the judgment that under a Home Rule Government, the interests and liberties of the Irish people and especially of Irish Protestants, would be insecure. The struggle between Catholics and Protestants would be intensified, and the eventual result would be the all but certainty of civil war of a most sanguinary character. Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule Scheme we hold to be at once degrading to us as citizens, and dangerous to the interests of the Empire." (Cheers.)

Now, if you please, examine these witnesses whom I have summoned as to character. I do not sustain every word that they have said; but is there anybody who is likely to know Ireland better than they are? (Hear, hear.) Are they biased by any partisan feeling? On the contrary, they belong to the section of the community to which your present Government was by no means welcome. They have no grounds to love us. They are driven by a strong sense of the truth of the cause and of the dangers which lie before them; and, setting aside all their feelings, all traditions, and all prepossessions, they have appealed to their co-religionists in this island to save them from the terrible secular calamity which they, with a thorough knowledge of the people and of the country, clearly see is involved in the measures which are proposed. (Cheers.) Do not tell me that they are animated by any principle of ascendency. They never had it, they never could have it. They speak from their knowledge, they speak from the bare facts of the case, and we in this country shall be mad if we do not pay attention to witnesses so competent to advise us. (Cheers.)

It has been said that *I have urged Ulster to rebellion. I do not in the least admit it;* but in place of a criticism of my own words, I should like to read to you the words of a great Prime Minister of the past, a man who never by his bitterest enemies was accused of reckless conduct or incautious language, I refer to the great Sir Robert Peel. (Cheers.) These were the words he used—"Repeal the Union, and you would then see the spirit of the Protestant North that has been lying, not asleep, but in watchful repose, confiding in the justice and protection of England, you would then see it arise in conscious strength to defend itself with its own native and sufficient energies from that vile, debasing denomination which would be begotten from the foul union of religious hatred and perverse ambition." (Cheers.) These are not my words, but they are much stronger than any words I have used.

And now with that warning from the grave of the illustrious past to guide you, I entreat you, I entreat the electors of Great Britain, to pause before they commit themselves to this mad experiment. I do not doubt that the dangers which we indicate are real. I know the spirit of the men with whom we are dealing; I

know, if you will, their prejudices, traditions, perhaps their exaggerated apprehensions; but I know *the strong fibre of the people* whom you are about to subject to the hoof of their hereditary foes. (Cheers.) I need only point out to you certain things which, no doubt, you have read to-day, and in the newspapers, in order to show you that you have not to deal with the ordinary divisions of religion or of class. You have to deal with Dr. Walsh and his political friends, the same Dr. Walsh who appears in the papers as the principal proprietor—the dominating proprietor—of a violent secular partisan journal. Now, remember that on your action at this next election may possibly depend the position which Great Britain will be called upon to adopt. The ancestors of these men in the north of Ireland won freedom for Ireland by the sacrifice of their blood and treasure. (Cheers.) If you put yourselves in that position, that you can be called upon to act against them, you will feel your arm paralyzed by the sense of all that they have done for freedom, and by the knowledge that every man to whom freedom and progress are dear in this country will sympathise with what they do. (Cheers.) Is not that a fearful position in which to put the majesty and the strength of the English law? (Cheers.) I will not prophecy what the immediate result would be, but I will say that in taking such a course you would be planting a root of bitterness under which the growth and strength of the Union, and the harmony and the strength of this Empire would wither away, and the most valuable and sacred institutions that you cherish would be shaken even to their base. (Loud Cheers.)

Appendix XVI.

THE CONSERVATIVE PROGRAMME.

In his speech at St. James' Hall, on June 15th, 1892, Mr. Balfour, speaking of the future Programme of the Conservative and Unionist party said: That programme included Irish Local Government; Scotch Crofters' and Private Bill Legislation; Reform of Registration; Employers' Liability; District Councils and Poor Law Reform, including Old Age Pensions and Workhouse Classification.

Mr. Balfour pointed out that the second reading of the Irish Local Government Bill was carried in June, 1892, by a majority of 92. He expressed himself in favour of registration reform, but insisted that if it was undertaken it should be complete, and that the gross inequalities of representation, especially those which favoured Ireland at the expense of England, should be remedied. His remarks upon the subject of poor law relief, small holdings, old age pensions, and workhouse management are well worthy of quotation.

POOR LAW RELIEF.

And if that be touched upon, there is no man who now listens to me but will admit that problems requiring the highest statesmanship and most cautious handling for a proper treatment will come before us for decision and resolution. (Hear, hear.) I do not know whether many of you are acquainted with the history of the Poor Law in England; but those who are — those who have made even the most cursory study of this great question — will, I am sure, agree that the old system of Poor Law relief which existed more

than 60 years ago was fraught with evils of the most serious kind to the very people whom it was intended to relieve, and that the means by which outdoor relief was given lowered wages, destroyed thrift, and burdened industry with a weight in the shape of rates which practically almost brought the whole agricultural community to ruin in the districts where the system prevailed. No man conscious of his responsibilities would move one finger or one step in a direction which would bring upon us again any fraction of the evils which then prevailed in many parts of the country. It is unsatisfactory, and it is more than unsatisfactory, that any appreciable proportion of our labouring population should be compelled to look to the workhouse or to public relief as the only resource of their old age. (Cheers.) It is also unsatisfactory, and more than unsatisfactory, that the *working men who have through a long life been industrious, honest and sober*, should be treated when they are obliged to seek relief in the workhouse more or less in the same category as the ordinary tramp or as the thriftless or the drunkard. (Cheers.) Let me consider each of these proposals very briefly in turn. First, the proposition that we ought not to sit quietly down under the system by which so large a proportion of the rural poor, at least in the south and west of England, are driven in their old age to the rates or to the workhouse.

I am in favour of extending, as far as possible, ownership in land; but I recognise that where there is a system of universal ownership in land, where the labourer and the owner are practically synonymous, a crisis like that which we have gone through falls, not upon the large landlord, for there is none, not upon the capitalist farmer, for there is none, but it falls directly and with unmitigated violence upon the labourer himself. (Cheers.) Therefore there are advantages to be found in our English system which could not be found in any other system, though we all desire to supplement that system *by an extension of the small yeoman owners throughout the country*. But that is not the point upon which I was engaged.

OLD AGE PENSIONS.

I want to say that undoubtedly the enormous efforts made by the great friendly societies (hear, hear), have produced, are producing, and will produce in future a most gigantic change with regard to the happiness of the agricultural labourer in periods of sickness, calamity, and old age; and, therefore, undoubtedly this evil which exists to a degree which in parts of England, I am afraid, if we thoroughly realize, would shock us beyond measure—the evil of poor relief being the inevitable end of a long and laborious life is, I think, in the process of natural mitigation. It is our business to consider whether, either through private enterprise or through the friendly societies, or in co-operation with the friendly societies, if they desire co-operation, or in some other way, we cannot anticipate the consummation which I believe to be inevitable, and so put an end to a state of things which is undoubtedly discreditable to our civilization. (Cheers.)

WORKHOUSE MANAGEMENT.

The second point that I would touch upon deals with the existing system of workhouse management. Here I think it will be possible, and, if possible, it is certainly desirable, that something should be done greatly to extend and improve the principle already recognized by our law *of classification in the workhouse*. (Hear, hear.) It is an undoubted shock. I will not say to our consciences, but to our best instincts, when we see two men living in cottages next to each other, engaged in the same pursuit, one of them, perhaps, thriftless, and a drunken fellow, the other a sober, well-conducted, industrious labourer, possibly even a labourer who has been able to save through his life, and who has invested in some village friendly society a portion of his hard-earned gains—it is a shock to see these two people, through the bankruptcy of this village association, an accident which is of but too frequent occurrence, reduced towards the end of their life to precisely the

same condition, sent to the same workhouse, and treated in the same way. (Hear, hear.) How far it would be well to draw a distinction between the two in practice I do not say; but that it would be possible I believe. But it will be only possible if you greatly extend your area of Poor Law administration, and enable a county to do what London can now do—namely, to devote special buildings to special classes. I am perfectly certain that in this way much can be done to alleviate the lot of the deserving poor. (Hear, hear.) There is another problem which calls for our most serious consideration. Take the case of a man who, after a long life, has fallen ill with a chronic illness, absolutely disabling him from work. Suppose such a man to require assistance which he cannot obtain at home, having no family. Suppose such a man sent to the workhouse on account of that necessary assistance. Under our existing system that man may have saved enough for a weekly pension of 3s. or 4s., and that pension is taken away by the Poor Law authorities before he can obtain workhouse assistance. I do not say that that system has not a certain logical justification, but I say it is inconsistent with thrift; it is a direct incentive to spending; and, if that is to be the end of a man who saves, as it is the end of a man who does not save, you remove from our working classes one of the greatest incentives to thrift that now exists. (Cheers.) I am aware that this is a problem of the utmost difficulty, but I think it is a problem which presses for solution; and, difficult though it is, I do not for one moment believe that it is beyond the capacity of Parliament, or of this Government (cheers), to deal with it adequately.

Appendix XVII.

Mr. BALFOUR ON LONDON QUESTIONS.

In 1879 the Conservative Government of Lord Beaconsfield made favourable arrangements with the whole of the Water Companies of London to purchase their interests for a sum of about Thirty Millions.

They introduced a Bill under which the Water Supply would have been placed under the control of a body of Trustees representing the ratepayers of London. Mr. Gladstone and his party opposed this Bill on the ground that the cost was excessive. They came into power in the following year, and though 5 years in office took no steps whatever to obtain the control of the Water for the people of London.

It is certain that the Water Companies could not now be bought out, under anything like fair terms, for less than Forty Millions; therefore London will be the loser through the opposition, delay and neglect of the Gladstonian party by Ten Million Pounds.

In 1884 the Liberals, who had an enormous majority in the House of Commons, introduced a Bill for the Government of London, which did not touch the Poor Law or the administration of the police.

This—the only attempt made by the Liberals when in office to deal with the question of London Reform—was dropped after a

little discussion. In the same year the Liberals passed a Franchise Bill by which London received far less than its fair share of members. The London County Council was created by the Conservatives in 1888.

Mr. Gladstone, speaking at the Memorial Hall on May 31, 1892, said that, if he were returned to power, London Reforms must be postponed till Home Rule is settled. These are his words:—

"I cannot leave this subject without mentioning Ireland. I mention it not with the length and multitude of details which so vast a question involves, but because I feel more than ever that which I have long endeavoured to impress upon my countrymen—that the Irish question is every man's question—not only because it disturbs the country, but because none of you can hope to see a rational progress in dealing with your own demands until that tremendous impediment and obstacle is cleared out of the way."

Replying to Mr. Gladstone in his speech at St. James' Hall, on June 15th, 1892, Mr. Arthur Balfour dealt fully with the London programme.

Mr. Balfour also dealt with the Registration Question. He defended the City of London and the London Companies, and opposed the placing of the London Police under the County Council. With regard to Ground Rents and the Rating Question generally, he was in favour of "making the incidence of taxation perfectly clear, and of bringing into the net of taxation every species of property which benefits by taxation." Mr. Balfour added:—

"ABOUT THE CITY OF LONDON AND THE CITY COMPANIES

I do not propose to say much. To destroy an ancient institution, to plunder ancient and wealthy corporations, are occupations so congenial to the special spirit of the Separatist party, that I should be sorry to deprive them of the pleasure of at all events attempting that task—(laughter)—but to contend for one moment that a single ratepayer in London or a single working-man in this gigantic metropolis would be one penny the better is to talk abject nonsense. (Cheers.) With regard to

GROUND RENTS AND THE RATING QUESTION GENERALLY,

I have no objection to the division of rates. On the contrary, though I believe that it will be found by those who take the experiment in hand that it is very much more difficult to carry out than they suppose, I am perfectly prepared—so long as no existing contract is interfered with—(hear, hear)—to see in this respect an alteration in the apparent incidence of taxation. So far as what are known as ground-rents especially are concerned, my view always has been, and is still, that these and all other forms of income should be brought into account in dealing with the subjects which have to be paid for at present out of the rates, and that, that is more justifiable than to do what you now do, namely, to throw education and all those other burdens, the list of which is too long to specify, not upon the people who benefit by them, but only upon a section of the people who benefit by them, and not upon people according as they do benefit by them, but according as they live in a dwelling rated at a greater or less amount. Therefore, I myself, though I see great practical difficulties in the way, would rejoice to see any alteration in the law which would make the incidence of taxation perfectly

clear, and which would bring into the net of taxation every species of property which benefits by taxation." (Hear, hear.)

Mr. Balfour was also in favour of giving the control of gas and water to the municipality of London, and stated that, in his opinion, the municipal life of London should be as full and as free as that of any other municipality in the kingdom. He added these words:—

"I am a member of the party who attempted 12 years ago to give a water supply to London—(cheers)—and were foiled by the machinations of Sir W. Harcourt. (Hear, hear.) I am a member of the party who desire to see London have her fair share of Parliamentary institutions, while Mr. Gladstone has systematically advocated the doctrine that London should be under-represented, because, forsooth, it is near Westminster, and I belong to the party which has done that which Mr. Gladstone has never succeeded in doing, to the party which has given London municipal institutions. (Cheers.) I will never be a consenting party to the doctrine of Mr. Gladstone that London is justified in taking only a London view of public affairs. London is not so justified.

IF LONDON IS ANYTHING IT IS AN IMPERIAL CITY

—(cheers)—and it is bound to take an Imperial view and not merely a London view of Imperial affairs. More than any other part of this great Empire, it has its interests bound up with the prosperity and health of the Empire as a whole; more than any other part of the Empire it is concerned in the sanctity of contracts, in the security of trade, in the greatness of the Empire, and in the success of your foreign policy. (Loud cheers.) If Londoners desire to pursue their own interests, which are those of the Empire at large, let them turn away from purely municipal affairs, which, in Mr. Gladstone's view, at all events, absorb so much of their attention. Let them recognise that, important as these municipal affairs may be, there are yet affairs in which they are more closely concerned, and those affairs are the prosperity, the security, and the greatness of the Empire of which London is the head. (N.U.)

Appendix XVIII.

ONE MAN ONE VOTE.

STRAINING AT A GNAT AND SWALLOWING A CAMEL.

By "One Man One Vote" the Radical leaders do not mean "A Vote for Every Man" or "Manhood Suffrage." They mean that no man is to have more than one vote; that is, that no elector is to vote in more than one constituency, although he may possess the legal qualification in more than one constituency. The old and sound theory of "No Taxation without Representation" was the basis for the plural franchise possessed by those who have property and who pay rates and taxes in more than one Parliamentary constituency.

The modern Radicals object to this right, which the old Radicals claimed as simple justice. There are many local as well as Imperial interests affected by Parliamentary representation; and it is often most important that those who have large

material interests in a constituency should have a share in the election of its member.

But the question involved in the cry, "One Man One Vote," as raised by our new-fangled Radicals, is not nearly so serious as they pretend. Indeed, they shirk its chief bearing.

It is estimated that the abolition of plural voting would only affect some 73,000 votes out of over six millions, and these are by no means all cast on the same side.

"ONE VOTE ONE VALUE."

But if the Radicals are really in earnest about electoral reform, and wish the House of Commons fairly to represent the voice of the people, why do they talk so much about this comparatively small alteration, and say nothing at all about the much greater injustice worked by the present unequal and unfair distribution of seats?

If it is right that one man should only have only one vote, it is equally just that every vote should have, as far as is practicable, the same value.

It is easy to show how very far this is from being the case.

The present distribution of the 670 seats in the House of Commons between the different portions of the United Kingdom is as follows:—

England has	465 members.
Wales has	30 ,,
Scotland has	72 ,,
Ireland has	103 ,,
Total	670

Now, see what the representation ought to be if population were taken as the basis of calculation. The average population for each member, dividing the total inhabitants. 37,740,283. by 670, should be 56,329:—

	Population 1891.	Seats.
England	27,499,984,	should have 490, or 25 more.
Wales	1,501,034,	,, ,, 27, or 3 less.
Scotland	4,033,103,	,, ,, 72, the same.
Ireland	4,705,162,	,, ,, 81, or 22 less.
Total		670

Or, taking the number of Electors as the basis of calculation :—

	Electors.		Seats.
England	4,508,246,	should have	493, or 28 more.
Wales	261,842,	,, ,,	29, or 1 less.
Scotland	744,816,	,, ,,	67, or 5 less.
Ireland	606,403,	,, ,,	81, or 22 less.
Total ...	6,121,307		670

The unfairness of the over-representation of Ireland becomes yet more patent if we take into consideration the relative taxation of the different parts of the United Kingdom. The Revenue of 1889–90 (as represented by the Exchequer receipts) contributed by each part of the United Kingdom was as follows :—

	£	Percentage of Total.
England and Wales ...	70,043,784	78·43
Scotland	9,482,422	10·62
Ireland	7,536,355	8·44
Imperial Sources	2,241,776	2·51
Total	£89,304,337	100

In other words, Ireland, with about one-eighth of the population of the United Kingdom, contributes, in the gross, only one-twelfth of the Imperial revenue.

It will thus be seen that a vote in Ireland is worth a good deal more than a vote in England, though the Irish contribute a great deal less proportionately to Imperial taxation, and their number of illiterate voters is, proportionately, twelve times as large.

And yet Mr. Gladstone, in the House of Commons (March 3, 1891), while not disputing the figures, ventured to assert : —

"The representation of England is fairly adjusted. I am not ashamed to say that I think, upon the whole, England is not entitled to complain ! ! !"

EXAMPLES OF INEQUALITY.

The contrast becomes still more glaring if Ireland and London be put side by side. The population of London is nearly the same as that of the whole of Ireland, yet Ireland is represented by 103 members, while London, which is certainly not inferior to it in intelligence and enterprise, is represented by 62 members only.

In other words, under the present system, an Irishman's vote is worth nearly double that of a Londoner.

Why do not the Radicals attempt to remedy this crying injustice? Is it because, while the majority of Irish members support Mr. Gladstone, the majority of London members are against him?

A few details will make the unfairness of the present distribution still more apparent. Mr. Justin McCarthy is member for Newry, which has a population of 13,605 and 1,875 electors. Sir Joseph Crossland is member for Huddersfield, which has 15,466 electors, and Mr. Balfour is member for the East Division of Manchester, which has a population of 85,407 and 11,038 electors.

In other words, each vote in Newry counterbalances six votes in East Manchester, and eight votes in Huddersfield.

Again, Kilkenny Borough has 13,323 inhabitants, and 1,639 electors, yet it returns a member to Parliament just as much as South-West Ham, with a population $8\frac{1}{2}$ times as great (112,598), and more than $8\frac{1}{2}$ times as many voters.

It must also be remembered that, as the population of England is rapidly growing, and that of Ireland decreasing, the unfairness of the present distribution is becoming greater every year.

Between various English constituencies, too, the inequality is very great. Why, for instance, should Northampton, with 10,895 electors, return two members, while Hammersmith, with 11,208 electors, and Huddersfield, with 15,466 electors, return only one each? Or why should the votes of 2,298 electors of Durham City carry as much weight as those of 11,581 electors in the Northern Division of Leeds?

If the Radicals are sincere, why do they not advocate a thorough reform? If they really wish for justice, why do they raise no protest against these gigantic anomalies? If they want the true expression of the people's wishes, and not merely to catch votes, why do they confine themselves to one comparatively small alteration in our electoral system and completely overlook a much greater evil? Why, if they are in earnest, do they stop short in their zeal for reform, precisely at the point where they think the change will cease to operate in their own favour?

If a Radical talks about "One Man one Vote," ask him "How about 'One Vote one Value?'"—(N.U.)

Appendix XIX.

MR. DILLON'S RECORD.

Mr. John Dillon, M.P., is one of the most eminent leaders of the majority of the Irish Nationalist party. The following extracts from his speeches give a pretty clear idea of his character and objects :—

ON CATTLE MAIMING.

At Kildare, on 15th August, 1880, Mr. Dillon drew attention to dumb animals as follows :—

"In the County of Mayo, where the organisation is pretty strong, we have many a farm lying idle, from which no rent can be drawn, and there they shall lie, and if the landlord should put cattle on them, the cattle won't prosper very much."—*Official Report, Queen v. Parnell, &c.*, p. 287.

ON THE "PLAN OF CAMPAIGN."

Mr. Dillon was the real author of the criminal conspiracy known as the "Plan of Campaign." It was clearly described by himself in the following speech, reported in *United Ireland*, 23rd October, 1886 :—

"When we meet with an estate where the people are courageous and determined, we advise them to meet together, each estate by itself, and decide what is a reasonable and fair reduction to ask. In some cases fifty or sixty per cent. would be reasonable; in some cases less, and in some more. Let the tenants meet together and decide what is fair to ask, and ask that together, and if they are refused there is but one course open to them, if they mean to fight according to the policy of brave men—that is, to pay a portion of the rent which they have offered to the landlord into the hands of two or three men in whom they place trust. *That must be done privately, and you must not inform the public where the money is placed.* Then every man who is evicted can get an allowance from them as long as he is out, and, believe me, if the landlord sees that, he won't go very far; for what ruined the agitation in Ireland in some places was this—the people went in for a half battle; they stood out, as they call it, that is, they refused to pay until there was a writ served. Then the landlord was encouraged to wait on. But if you mean to fight really you must put the money aside for two reasons; first of all, because you want means to support the men who are hit first; and secondly, because you want to prohibit traitors going behind your back. There is no way to deal with a traitor except to get his money under lock and key—and if you find that he pays his rent, and betrays the organisation, what will you do with him? I will tell you what to do with him. Close upon his money and use it for the organisation."

Thus, under the "Plan," tenants were invited to decide for themselves how much rent they would pay their landlord, and, if he refused to bow to their decision, their money was paid over to the National League. The injustice of the scheme may be learnt from another speech by Mr. Dillon, in County Kerry, on Sunday, 23rd January, 1887, in which he boasted that he could show "men who can pay and won't pay, because I tell them not to pay;" "who avow that they can pay, and refuse to pay "because they are in the Plan of Campaign."—(*Freeman's Journal*, 24th January, 1887.)

THREATS TO TENANTS.

Referring to the campaigners at Eyrecourt, on Sunday, 28th November, 1886, Mr. Dillon, said:—

"One thing you may be perfectly certain of, that the committees which we have elected upon this estate will make it their business—and you need not take any trouble about it—they will make it their business to ascertain who betrays the combination. Well, *the man who betrays the combination will never see a shilling of his money back again.*—*Freeman's Journal*, 29th November, 1886.

MORE INTIMIDATION.

Mr. Dillon, at Castlerea, county Roscommon, on December 5th, 1886, is reported as follows:—

"The time is at hand, and very close at hand too, *when the police will be our servants*, when the police will be taking their pay from Mr. Parnell, when he will be Prime Minister of Ireland. And I warn the men to-day, who take their stand by the side of landlordism, and signalise themselves as the enemies of the people, that in the time of our power we will remember them. And I warn you that in the struggle you are going into this winter, *your enemies have* a day of reckoning at hand. I will go further, and say that officers of the law who make themselves prominent against the people by their harshness and cruelty, if they want promotion when the Irish Government is in power, will have to go elsewhere than to us to look for it."—*Freeman's Journal*, 6th December, 1886.

At Dublin, on 23rd August, 1887, Mr. Dillon said:—

"I want to say plainly that so far as I go I intend to practise the same form o intimidation, in spite of all proclamations or persecutions they can enforce. *If the operations of the League in the past can be correctly described by 'Intimidation,' then I say I intend to practise them and preach them.*"—*Freeman's Journal*, 24th August, 1887.

"I am alluding now to the combination amongst the tenants known as the Plan of Campaign. Now let me say this that if there be a man in Ireland, and I do not believe there is; if there is a man in Ireland base enough to back down, to turn his back on the fight now that coercion has passed, I pledge myself in the face of this meeting that I *will denounce him from public platforms by name, and I pledge myself to the Government that, let that man be whom he may, his life* will not be a happy *one*, either in Ireland or across the seas, and I say this with the intention of carrying out what I say."—*Freeman's Journal*, 24th August, 1887.

AN OUT-SPOKEN SEPARATIST.—At Limerick Junction, on 10th August, 1891, Mr. Dillon, as reported in the *National Press*, spoke as follows:—

"Men of Tipperary, it is fifteen years since I first made the acquaintance of the men of Tipperary and the barony of Clanwilliam. When, on this very platform, I arrived, to be greeted by, I suppose, the most significant demonstration of public enthusiasm, because I was seated beside that veteran warrior of Irish nationality, John Mitchel. That was my first step in Irish politics, when, side by side with the men of Clanwilliam and Tipperary, we returned that felon John Mitchel to represent this county in the Imperial Parliament; and I confess it amazes me to-day when I see men who were never heard of in Irish politics until yesterday lecturing me and lecturing my friend, William O'Brien on Irish nationality, and telling me, forsooth, and telling William O'Brien that we do not know how to maintain *the independence* of Ireland. My record in Irish politics is before you from the date of the Mitchel election to the present hour, and I defy any man to say that I have *ever*

lowered the tone of Irish nationality, pulled or held down the flag of Ireland before any Minister or any minion in power. No, whenever the hour comes that I am false to the cause of Irish independence, believe me I'll get a very different reception at the Limerick Junction."

MR. GLADSTONE AND SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT ON MR. DILLON.

Speaking in the House of Commons (*Hansard*, 24th May, 1882), within three weeks of the murder of Lord Frederick Cavendish, Mr. Gladstone said of Mr. Dillon :—

"The hon. gentleman comes here as the apostle of a creed which is a creed of force, which is a creed of oppression, which is a creed of the destruction of all liberty, and of the erection of a despotism against it, and on its ruins, different from every other despotism only in this, that it is more absolutely detached from all law, from all tradition and from all restraint."

Speaking in the House of Commons on 3rd March, 1881, Sir William Harcourt said :—

"We have heard the doctrine of the Land League expounded by the man who is an authority to explain it (Mr. Dillon). The doctrine so expounded is the doctrine of treason and assassination."—[N.U., No. 93].

Appendix XX.

TRADE STATISTICS.

VOLUME OF TRADE UNDER LORD SALISBURY.

The rise in the value of Exports and Imports since 1886 is shown in the following table*:—

1886	£618,000,000
1887	642,000,000
1888	685,000,000
1889	742,000,000
1890	748,000,000
1891	744,000,000
1892	

The increase from 1886 to 1891 (126 millions) is equal to more than £3 per head of the population. The trade with the Colonies alone accounts for one-fifth of the increase. The export and import trade of India also shows an advance of 33 millions.

SHIPPING TRADE.

The British and foreign vessels entered and cleared, with cargoes only (home and foreign trade), in 1886 had a tonnage of †	105,420,000
In 1891 the tonnage of the same was †	119,248,000
Or an increase over 1886 of ...	Tons 13,828,000

* *Statistical Abstract*, p. 47, and *Board of Trade Returns* for 1891. † *Statistical Abstract*, p. 142, and *Return*, May, 1892.

The British vessels registered under the Merchant Shipping Acts have increased in the same period by 916,000 tons. The number of persons employed thereon is larger by 29,000 while the wages of seamen at all the ports has increased by an average of £1 a month.¶

RAILWAYS.

The Gross Receipts of the Railways in the Kingdom in 1886 were ‡	£69,555,000
In 1890 they had risen to	79,948,000
An increase in four years of	£10,393,000

COAL AND IRON.

These tables contain the lastest statistics of production :—

	Tons.
The Coal raised in the United Kingdom in 1886 was §	157,578,000
In 1891 the amount raised was ¶	185,479,000
Increase in five years	27,901,000
The Pig Iron produced in 1886 amounted to § ...	7,009,000
The same in 1891 was §	7,406,000
Increase in five years	397,000

Appendix XXI.

IMPERIAL EXPENDITURE.

FROM "SIX YEARS' WORK."

The Gross Expenditure in 1885-6, under Mr. Gladstone, was ...	*£92,223,000
The same under Lord Salisbury, in 1891-2, was	†£90,264,000
Or a Decrease of	£1,959,000

Moreover, the expenditure for 1891-2 included £1,500,000 for Free Education : £2,000,000 for the Post Office ; £2,000,000 for the Army and Navy ; and £1,500,000 for Gold Coinage, Barracks, and Irish Railways : in all £7,000,000 over and above what Mr. Gladstone provided for the same services.

It is true that the figures for 1886 include Mr. Gladstone's Vote of Credit of £9,500,000 for panic preparations for war with Russia ; but on the other hand, they exclude about Six Millions of National Debt payments, which were suspended by him, and which, if taken into account, would have raised Mr. Gladstone's expenditure in that year to *ninety-eight millions.*

‡ *Statistical Abstract*, p. 176. § *Id.*, p. 182 ; *Parl. Ppr.* C. 6,657, and *Return*, May, 1892. ¶ *Parl. Ppr.* 227 o 1892, pp. 37 and 42.

* *Statistical Abstract*, p 7. † *Parl. Paper*, 162 of 1892.

EXPENDITURE PER HEAD.

Mr. Gladstone.					Lord Salisbury.				
1881	...	£2	5	9	1887	...	£2	9	4
1882	...	2	7	6	1888	...	2	7	6
1883	...	2	9	4	1889	...	2	7	3
1884	...	2	8	5	1890	...	2	6	0
1885	...	2	9	5	1891	...	2	6	5
1886	...	2	10	10	1892	...	2	6	11
Average	...	£2	8	6	Average	...	£2	7	2

Compiled from *Statistical Abstract*, pp. 7 and 213.

SURPLUSES OF REVENUE.

1887	...	...	...	£776,000
1888	...	...	...	2,378,000
1889	...	...	...	2,789,000
1890	...	...	...	3,221,000*
1891	..	..	...	1,756,000
1892	...	...	..	1,067,000
Total Surpluses		...	...	£11,987,000

NOTE.—The surpluses above alluded to have been described by Gladstonian speakers as "bogus surpluses" because they do not take into account moneys borrowed for capital expenditure. The answer to this is simple. *Money has been borrowed in order to defray the cost of Naval defence, fortifications, barracks, &c. Such expenditure has never been treated as chargeable against Revenue. Mr. Gladstone himself in 1872 borrowed money for fortifications, &c., and which is still being paid off*, and which was not treated as part of the expenditure of the year. A realised surplus is the amount at credit after the expenditure which Parliament has directed to be made out of revenue has been so met.

UNDER LORD SALISBURY.

Lord Salisbury's Government in six years has REDUCED TAXATION by £24,965,000

Or deducting various taxes IMPOSED or increased. in the same period, to the amount of £6,234,000

There remains a NET REDUCTION in the taxation of the country of £18,731,000

N.B.—These results are arrived at by comparing the figures given in the *Statistical Abstract*, pp. 20 to 25, taking into account the number of years each remission or increase of taxation remained in force under each Government. It is claimed for this comparison that it is as accurate as circumstances permit.

* Including £2,009,000 applied out of Revenue under the National Debt Conversion Act.

PRESSURE OF TAXATION.

UNDER Mr. GLADSTONE.

In the years 1881 to 1886 Mr. Gladstone levied	
INCREASED TAXATION to the amount of	£71,925,000
But he reduced other Taxes to the extent of	54,154,000
Leaving a net ADDITION to the burdens of the Country of	£17,771,000

N.B.—*Mr. Gladstone found the Income Tax at 5d. and left it at 8d. He remitted no Tax on any single article of consumption.* According to the *Financial Reform Almanack* for 1892, a publication issued by an Association of which Sir Charles Dilke, Mr. John Morley, Mr. Labouchere, and other Gladstonian members are vice-presidents :—"Even the most *enthusiastic Radical must, as far as finance is concerned, look upon the years* 1880-5 *with regret. Mr. Gladstone was in power.* Mr. Gladstone had a splendid majority, but *we seek in vain for any sign of that majority*—that is to say, that power for accomplishing reform which the nation had given him—*being used to procure justice in taxation.*"

NOTE.—Mr. Gladstone during his term of office increased the grants in aid of local rates by only £860,000, and then only in consequence of Conservative pressure and under the apprehension of defeat in Parliament.

Lord Salisbury's Government, of its own motion, gave nearly Sixteen Millions in aid of local rates, over and above what was given by Mr. Gladstone in the same time, and the annual relief was nearly Five Millions a year in excess of the sum contributed in 1886 ; a difference in England and Wales, which is equivalent to 5d. in the £ on the rateable value of the country.

APPENDIX XXII.

LOCAL TAXATION.

It had been for many years the practice of succeeding Ministries to assist the Local Rates by "grants in aid" from Imperial Revenue. After 1889, however, Lord Salisbury's Government made over to local authorities the proceeds of certain licenses and duties, withdrawing at the same time part of the Grants in Aid. A comparison of the respective assistance afforded to local taxation by Mr. Gladstone's and Lord Salisbury's Government is shown in the following table.

GLADSTONE GOVERNMENT.		SALISBURY GOVERNMENT.	
1880-1—Grants in Aid*	£4,914,000	1886-7—Grants in Aid*	£5,854,000
1881-2 ,, ,,	5,096,000	1887-8 ,, ,, *	6,203,000
1882-3 ,, ,,	5,763,000	1888-9 ,, ,, *	5,661,000
1883-4 ,, ,,	5,640,000	,, Probate Duty †	1,400,000
1884-5 ,, ,,	5,593,000	1889-90—Grants in Aid*	3,338,000
1885-6 ,, ,,	5,775,000	,, Licenses and Probate Duty †	5,185,000
		1890-1—Grants in Aid *	3,162,000
		,, Licenses, Beer and Spirit Duties and Probate Duty †	6,974,000
		1891-2—Grants in Aid ‡	3,000,000
		,, Licenses, Beer and Spirit Duties and Probate Duty §	7,630,000
Total relief of Local Taxation	£32,781,000	Total relief of Local Taxation	£48,407,000

* *Statistical Abstract*, pp. 14 and 15. † Id. p. 28. ‡ Estimate on basis of 1890-91.
§ Mr. Goschen's Budget Speech, 11th April, 1892.

APPENDIX XXIII.

REDUCTION OF THE NATIONAL DEBT.

Mr. Gladstone left the National Debt at *	£713,454,000
In five years (1887-91) Lord Salisbury's Government had reduced it to*	680,681,000
Showing a net reduction of ...	£32,773,000
Or, taking into account the Exchequer balances, which had been increased since 1886 by *	745,000
And the reduction of Debt effected in 1891-2	5,330,000
The NET LIABILITIES of the State are LESS by ...	£38,848,000

In a similar period Mr. Gladstone was only able to show a reduction, between 1880 and 1886, of £28,400,000.* Moreover, *he twice failed* (1853 and 1884) *to carry a Conversion scheme*, which Lord Salisbury's Government successfully carried into effect.

NONE.—"For the reduction which Mr. Goschen effected in the interest of the National Debt he deserves our warm acknowledgments."—*Mr. Gladstone at Hastings, March 16th*, 1891.

The Gladstonian Party attempt to minimise the effect of these reductions by a charge which Lord Roseberry has formulated thus: "The Government have tam-"pered with the Sinking Fund, set on foot by a Tory Government, and which they "were bound to respect by every tradition of honour and honesty."—*Epsom*, June 9th, 1892.

This assertion is contrary to fact. The amount set apart for the service of the Debt was established by Sir S. Northcote at 28 millions in 1877, with the distinct reservation that "if the circumstances of the country should materially alter, it "would only be right that we should take steps to take off what we now propose to "put on." (*Hansard.*) Mr. Goschen found that, owing to the action of Mr. Gladstone's Government, the circumstances *had* materially altered. The Income Tax stood at a war rate, 8d. in the £; and other taxes had increased by 2s. 6d. per head since Sir S. Northcote's time. Instead of maintaining taxation at this high rate, Mr. Goschen has reduced the payments for debt by £1,300,000; he has also saved £1,400,000 a year in interest through the Conversion scheme, and £300,000 is replaced by an alteration in the local loans system. *The result is that the people pay 3 millions a-year less as a fixed charge for the interest and reduction of Debt;* but the pace at which the Debt itself has been reduced is not slackened, as the continuous surpluses (see Table above), all of which are applied directly to the extinction of Debt, have more than compensated for the loss.

The charge of "tampering" with the Sinking Fund comes with a bad grace from the Gladstonian Party, who *wholly* suspended it in 1886.

APPENDIX XXIV.

BUDGET SUMMARY OF THE CONSERVATIVE GOVERNMENT UP TO END OF 1891.

(*Compiled from the "Statistical Abstract," and Mr. Goschen's Speeches.*)

The Revenue has exceeded expectations by £9,815,000
Expenditure has decreased, as compared with 1886, by £1,959,000

* *Statistical Abstract*, p 29. † Mr. Goschen's Budget Speech, April 11, 1892.

The National Debt has been decreased by	£38,848,000
Surpluses have accrued to the extent of	£11,987,000
The Income Tax has been reduced by an annual ...	£4,000,000
The Tobacco Duty was reduced annually by ...	£500,000
The duty on Tea and Currants was reduced annually by	£1,700,000
The Inhabited House Duty was reduced annually by	£550,000
Imperial Taxation was reduced in all by	£18,731,000
Free Education was provided for at an annual cost of	£2,500,000
Naval Defence was provided for by an annual addition of	£2,000,000
Local Rates were relieved by an extra annual contribution of	£4,720,000
Local Taxation was relieved in all by	£15,626,000
The Conversion of Consols effected an immediate annual saving (in interest) of	£1,400,000
The Conversion will ultimately save, annually ...	£2,800,000
Equal to an ultimate capital Reduction of the National Debt by	£100,000,000

Appendix XXV.

IMPROVEMENTS IN THE POST OFFICE UNDER LORD SALISBURY.

POSTAL FACILITIES.

A new series of postage stamps was introduced, affording greater security and convenience to the public.

Friendly Societies' circulars, containing statements of account, and *polling cards*, were allowed to pass at *the half-penny rate of postage*. Free re-direction of letters was given.

An "Express Delivery" for letters and parcels was established, and an arrangement made with all railway companies for the special conveyance of urgent letters.

The price of post cards was considerably reduced, and a new contract made, saving £26,000 a year.

Letter-cards were introduced. Extensions of the posts in rural districts were granted under a more liberal scheme. *400 new post offices* were opened in the last twelve months.

SAMPLE POST.

The inland sample post was re-established, and offers greater facilities to tradesmen and their customers.

PARCEL POST.

The parcel post was enormously developed, and many foreign countries and colonies were brought within its scope.

Parcel coaches were established on certain routes, effecting both speed and economy in delivery.

FOREIGN AND COLONIAL MAILS.

New contracts were made for India, China, and the West Indies, securing increased speed and a saving of £112 000 a year.

Two services a week to New York were arranged by Cunard and White Star lines.

The Canadian Pacific route was secured for mails, troops, and stores to China and Japan, by British ships and on British territory.

A weekly "all sea" service to Australia was arranged at a cheap postage rate; and post cards to Australia reduced to 2d.

A uniform postal rate of 2½d. for all countries in the Postal Union, as a whole, was established.

INLAND MONEY ORDERS.

The rates of commission were revised and reduced. Telegraphic money orders were introduced, and their sale extended to all head and branch post offices. About 1,800 new money order offices have been opened since 1886.

TELEGRAPHS.

The telegraphs account, which hitherto showed a deficiency, produced in 1891 a surplus of over £100,000.

The submarine cables to France, Germany, Belgium, and Holland were purchased, and the charge for telegrams reduced to 2d. per word.

Direct communication was established with Berlin, Rome and Vienna. New cables were laid to France and Germany. Arrangements are being made with the telephone companies for the extension and improvement of their systems. Telephonic communication was opened between London and Paris. About 1,400 new telegraph offices were opened since 1886, and the terms of guarantees for such offices were much reduced.

POST OFFICE STAFF.

Since 1886 *the pay and conditions* of service of practically the *entire staff of the post office*, have been revised and *improved*. In 1890 increases of pay, and improvements as to sick pay, overtime and Sunday work were granted to the sorters, sorting clerks and telegraphists throughout the Kingdom. In 1891, *the wages* of the *postmen throughout the provinces were raised*, and a similar increase was given to the postmen in London. These improvements extended to about 35,000 persons. *The increase in expenditure* involved is estimated at about £400,000 *a year*.

About 20,000 situations were opened to army reserve men, and army and navy pensioners.

SAVINGS BANKS.

Greater facilities are given for investing in Government Stock, and the minimum for purchase or sale was reduced to 1s.

The *capital in Post Office Savings Banks* has increased since 1886 by *nearly* £21,000,000.

Two Acts of Parliament were passed to facilitate the use of the Savings Banks.

Facilities were given to School Managers and others for receiving *small deposits from children* since the passing of the Free Education Act. Many thousands of accounts were thus opened.

COST.

The Conservative Government very largely increased the expenditure on the postal and telegraphic system. Abandoning the theory that the Post Office was to be merely a source of revenue to the Exchequer, they expended large sums in extending its usefulness, providing vastly increased facilities for the public, increasing the wages of its servants (especially in the lower grades), and popularising every branch of its operations. The cost of the improved services of the Post Office

under Lord Salisbury's Government as compared with the period under Mr. Gladstone, is shown in the following table*:—

Mr. Gladstone.			Lord Salisbury.		
1881	...	£5,368,461	1887	...	£8,092,842
1882	...	5,678,031	1888	...	8,036,982
1883	...	6,054,297	1889	...	8,265,836
1884	...	6,931,587	1890	...	8,249,660
1885	...	7,121,729	1891	...	8,656,963
1886	...	7,265,693	1892	...	9,316,000
		£38,419,798			£50,668 283

As one result of this expenditure, the Post Office revenue increased from £10,280,000 in 1887 to £12.630,000 in 1892, so that every penny of increased cost has brought in nearly twopence in revenue.

* *Statistical Abstract*, pp. 12 and 13.

Appendix XXVI.

WAR EXPENDITURE.

Gladstone Government.*			Salisbury Government.
Transvaal War, 1880–3	... ...	£2,439.500	NIL.
Egyptian Expedition, 1882–4	... ...	4,276,750	
First Vote of Credit, 1884–5	... ...	300,000	
Nile Expedition, 1884–5 (Gordon)	...	1,324,000	
Soudan War, 1884–5	... ...	964,000	
Bechuanaland Expedition, 1884–5	...	725,000	
Vote of Credit, 1885–6 (Russian Panic)		9,451,000	
Total	...	£19,480,250	

MISCELLANEOUS.

CURRENCY.

A new series of coins was issued to the public, and the currency was improved by calling in all foreign bronze money.

All light gold was re-called, and the loss removed from innocent holders, and borne by the State.

CIVIL SERVICE.

Consequent on the report of a Royal Commission (Sir M. White Ridley, Chairman), extensive reforms were carried out in the Civil Service, by which the public interests were promoted without injustice to civil servants.

Numerous sinecure or unnecessary offices were abolished without the necessity of legislation; and when legislation was required it was promptly appealed to.

COMMERCIAL PROGRESS.

The rise in value after 1886 of all the leading securities, in which the wealth and savings of the country are invested, was proof of the prosperity which accompanied Lord Salisbury's Administration. In almost every branch of business—Railways, Banks, City Loans, Shipping, &c.,—the first-class securities all showed largely enhanced values after 1886. The facts may be attested by a comparison of the figures in *Burdett's Official Intelligencer* for the year 1887, and the *Investor's Monthly Record* for June, 1892.

* Parl. Paper 338 of 1890 (Mr. Childer's return).

Appendix XXVII.

THE NATIONAL DEFENCES UNDER LORD SALISBURY.

In this category are comprised all measures for the defence of the Empire, the better protection of ports and coaling stations, and for promoting the health, comfort, and efficiency of the Army and the Navy.

LEGISLATION.

*IMPERIAL DEFENCE ACT, 1888 (Mr. W. H Smith).

OBJECT.

To carry out an agreement for the naval defence of the Australian Colonies, and to provide for the defence of ports and coaling stations abroad.

MEANS.

The Act ratifies an agreement made between the Government and the Australian Colonies, by which a squadron is maintained in Australasian waters; its first cost being paid by England, and the Colonies paying the interest thereon and maintenance charges.

It further provides for the *armament of certain ports and coaling stations at a cost of £2,600,000 which is to be repaid out of the profits of the Suez Canal Shares* bought by Lord Beaconsfield, and which will become available in 1894, and will be worth at that time, in all probability, no less than £19,000,000, or nearly five times their original cost.

RESULTS.

Four years ago, according to an impartial authority, the Gladstonian Lord Brassey, "no modern guns were effectively mounted in any one of our fortresses "or coaling stations, except the four big guns at Malta and Gibraltar. Now a "powerful armament has in all cases largely added to their security. Among the "places so strengthened are Portsmouth, the Thames, Plymouth, Malta, and "Gibraltar."—*Naval Annual*, 1891.

Armaments have also gone out to Singapore, Hong Kong, Table Bay, Colombo, Jamaica, and Sierra Leone, as well as to Aden, Mauritius, and other places.

* NAVAL DEFENCE ACT, 1889 (Lord George Hamilton).

OBJECT.

To increase the defences of the country *by the construction of seventy vessels*, so that the Navy may be made equal in strength to that of any two foreign powers.

MEANS.

The Act provided for the construction of 8 first-class battle-ships, each of 14,000 tons, 2 second-class of 9,000 tons, 9 first-class cruisers of 7,300 tons, 29 smaller cruisers of 3,400 tons, 4 cruisers of 2,600 tons, and 18 torpedo boats.

The cost of these vessels was stated at £21,500,000, of which £11,500,000 was provided by loans spread over the five years ending in 1894, and £10,000,000 out of taxation spread over seven years.

RESULTS.

Out of thirty-two ships to be built by contract, nearly all have been delivered by the contractors, and the remainder are in course of construction, and will mostly be delivered before 1894.

Thirty-eight ships were allotted to be constructed in dockyards; all have been completed. All the first-class battle-ships have been launched, and no difficulty is anticipated in completing the whole programme by the time stated in the Act—viz., 1894.*

NOTE.—The Bill was bitterly opposed by a large section of the Gladstonian Party.

* NATIONAL DEFENCE ACT, 1888 (MR. E. STANHOPE).

OBJECT.

To render the denfensive forces of the country readily available in case of attack.

MEANS.

Under this Act the Government is empowered in any national emergency to take precedence for naval and military traffic on railways; and to requisition, by hire or purchase, carriages, horses and vessels.

OFFICIAL SECRETS ACT, 1889 (SIR R. WEBSTER).

OBJECT.

To remedy a defect in the law by which the betrayal of confidential information relating to the defences had been left unpunished.

BARRACKS ACT, 1890 (MR. E. STANHOPE).

OBJECT.

The re-housing of the Regular Army, rendered necessary by the obsolete and unhealthy condition of many of the present barracks.

MEANS.

The Act provides for the expenditure of £4,100,000 in building and enlarging barracks and camps in the United Kingdom and the Colonies The chief expenditure is in re-building and additions at Aldershot, which absorb £1,475,000; the Curragh £420,000; Dublin £286,000; Shorncliffe £165,000; with minor expenditure at Colchester, Woolwich, Belfast, Portsmouth, Plymouth, &c. There is also provision for new barracks at Cape Town, Malta, Gibraltar and Bermuda.

APPENDIX XXVIII.

ARMY ADMINISTRATION.

ROYAL COMMISSIONS.

A highly important Commission, under the chairmanship of the Duke of Devonshire (then Lord Hartington), investigated the relations between the two great spending departments, and many of its recommendations were carried out by Lord George Hamilton and Mr. Stanhope.

A second Commission, under the presidency of Sir Fitzjames Stephen, examined the system of providing and manufacturing warlike stores; and some of the reforms described below are due to suggestions made by it.

WAR OFFICE.

Consequent on the report of the Royal Commission (appointed at the instance of the present Government), the internal organisation of the department was completely overhauled, and definite financial control was extended over all its branches.

* Parl. Paper C. 6602 of 1892.

EXPENDITURE.

Almost every *item of ordinary expenditure showed a decrease after* 1886, except such as were due to the increased strength of the Army, the additional grants to Volunteers, and additional weapons and stores.

ARMY ORGANIZATION.

Complete arrangements were made for *rapidly mobilising a Field Army of three army corps* for home defence, every unit being assigned its position; and a mobile force for foreign service was organised in every detail.

A complete plan was adopted for the defence of London, and the necessary positions for assembling and concentrating troops were acquired.

The defences of the Home Ports was completed, in many cases involving re-armament. Under Mr. Gladstone's Government, "no breech-loading gun, with the exception of two, had been effectively mounted in any of our ports at home or abroad." (Parliamentary Debates, 1892, II., 231.)

The re-organisation of the Garrison Artillery was carried out, by which a special and highly-trained force is allotted to each garrison.

The Commissariat and Transport Department was thoroughly re-organised on a military basis, with complete responsibility throughout.

The Medical and Veterinary Departments were revised, and the status of officers improved by the grant of substantive rank. An Army Medical Reserve was also founded.

The Pay system was localised, thereby effecting a considerable saving, and a local audit was provided for.

The Retirement rules were altered with the effect of eventually making large reductions in the Pension List.

The establishment of Generals was reduced, and the numbers fixed in accordance with the modern requirements of the service.

The supply of Horses in time of War was ensured by a system of registration, and the creation of a Horse Reserve, by which the use in emergency of 14,000 horses is secured.

The Food of the private soldiers was greatly improved, increased sanitary provisions made for their barracks, and greater provision made for their comfort in many ways.

WEAPONS AND STORES.

A new and powerful magazine rifle was introduced and 300,000 were completed.

The Ordnance factories were placed under one control, leading both to efficiency and economy, and to the avoidance of confusion.

The manufacture and inspection of weapons was entirely separated, leading to improved quality and economy.

Every weapon in the hands of our troops was thoroughly tested, so that the scandal of broken swords and twisted bayonets, as at Suakim, in 1884, will be no longer possible. *The purchase of swords and bayonets of German manufacture was absolutely stopped.*

The Cavalry were supplied with machine guns.

The Stores formerly collected in a confused mass at Woolwich were decentralised, and placed in depôts, whence they can rapidly be issued when required. Storehouses to the number of 177 have been arranged.

Guns of large calibre, to the number of 174, were supplied to the service, besides an enormous number of smaller guns; and 53 *batteries of Artillery were furnished with the new* 12 *pr. guns.*

Smokeless powder was introduced on a large scale with satisfactory results.

The construction of Guns for the Navy was enormously quickened, so that ships were no longer kept for months idly waiting for their armament.

The employment of private traders in the supply of stores was largely extended, and the system of open contracts was greatly developed.

RESERVE FORCES.

The training and instruction of the Militia was greatly improved; its place in the mobilisation scheme was allotted, and the necessary stores of clothing, etc., were laid in.

A scheme was adopted for re-organising the Yeomanry, and assigning them their definite places on mobilisation.

THE VOLUNTEERS

Were provided with complete Field Equipment: the Capitation grant was increased to 35*s.*: extra allowances were given for attendance at Brigade Camps, and *travelling allowances* to rifle ranges; *clothing allowances* for great coats were granted; *extra grants for tactics and signalling*, and encouragement was given to special training in musketry, mounted drill, cycling, submarine mining, engineering, &c.

The infantry was organised in 33 Brigades, and 88 batteries of mobile artillery were provided with guns. Volunteer officers were granted the right of presentation at Court, and a special decoration for long service.

The sums expended on the Volunteers in 1891-2 was *£761,000* as against *£624,000 in 1886-7*.

VETERANS.

A most important step was taken towards *throwing open a number of posts in the Civil Service to men of good conduct* who have passed through the army, and arrangements were made with the Post Office and other departments, and with the great railway companies to employ them.

SUMMARY:

The numerical strength of the army in 1886 and on January 1st, 1892, is shown in the table below:—

	1886.	1892.
Regular Army	200,785	211,590
Army Reserve	48,712	68,933
Militia	106,293	102,032
Yeomanry	11,499	10,768
Enrolled Volunteers... ...	226,752	222,046
Total ...	594.041	615,369

LORD WOLSELEY'S TESTIMONY.

"Of this there can be no doubt, that, since the Peninsula War, we have never had so strong or so efficient an Army. Looking at it as a military machine, it has never before been so fit for quick conversion into a fighting army in the field, and never before has the country been in a better position to resist invasion."—*Times*, June 11th, 1892.

Appendix XXIX.

CONSERVATIVE NAVAL ADMINISTRATION.

SHIPS.

A standard was fixed by which the naval establishments were to be maintained on an equality with those of any two great Powers combined.

By the Naval Defence Act special powers were granted to secure the uninterrupted prosecution of the shipbuilding programme, so as rapidly to reach the standard strength.

The *financial co-operation of the Australian Colonies* was obtained in the building and equipping of a special squadron for service in Australasian waters.

During the six years, 1886—1892, 112 war ships were completed for sea, and provision was made for the completion of 20 in 1892-93, and 35 subsequently under the Naval Defence Act.

The following ships of large size were completed, and designed for completion, during the three quinquennial periods from 1880 to 1895.

	Mr. Gladstone. 1880-85.	Lord Salisbury. 1885-90.	1890-95.
Armoured Ships	7	15	12
Belted Cruisers	—	7	—
Cruisers	7	31	51
	14	53	63

A programme of shipbuilding was started to gradually take the place of the ships building and completing in 1892, which would give in addition, during the five years, 1893-8, 7 battleships, 12 cruisers, 12 gun boats, and 70 torpedo boat destroyers.

Provision was likewise made for the re-construction of ironclads, which would otherwise have become non-effective, viz. :—

Re-armed	10
Re-engined	5
Re-boilered	9

Five more ironclads were to be taken in hand in the course of the financial year, 1892-93.

Close attention was given to the construction and performance of boilers and engines in the Navy, and a permanent committee of experts was appointed to assist in the preparation of designs.

Improved methods of steam trials for ships of war were adopted.

A subsidised Reserve of Merchant Cruisers was formed, consisting of 13 of the fastest mail steamers afloat, specially fitted for use as armed cruisers in time of war; and the right to take for naval service 15 other fast steamers of the same class, without subsidy, was secured.

DOCKYARDS.

Extensive reforms were carried out in Dockyard Administration, including more speedy and economical methods of shipbuilding.

Under *Mr. Gladstone's* Government, *first class ironclads were*, on the *average*, *seven years in building and completing for sea*; under the Conservative Government

the same class of vessel, but larger in size was completed *in less than four years*, and one, the "*Royal Sovereign*" (14,000 tons), was actually completed and commissioned in 2 years and 8 months.

The total Wages Vote to be expended in the Dockyards at Home was £1,563,000, as against £1,476,000 in 1886; and the average earnings of the men employed were increased from £62 in 1886 to £70 in 1892.

The lowest weekly pay of ordinary labourer was raised from *15s. to 18s. per week.*

The established pay of skilled labourers was raised from *19s. 6d. to 23s. per week*, and of ordinary labourers from 16s. 6d. to 17s. 6d. per week.

The maximum established pay of *hired shipwrights* was raised *from 30s. to 33s. per week*, and of joiners from 27s. to 30s. per week.

A new class of charge men was formed with from 6d. to 1s. a day extra pay, and it was thrown open to good workmen without examination.

All leading men were advanced 6d. a day.

A fixed number of workmen on the old establishment are annually advanced from the lower to higher grades of pay, irrespective of vacancies.

Gratuities on discharge through reduction of work are now granted after seven years' service, instead of after twenty years' service.

ARMAMENTS.

The cost, custody and administration of Naval Ordnance were transferred to naval votes, so as to give the Admiralty financial responsibility and prevent delay in supply.

Reserves of ordnance and ammunition were largely increased, and armament or 50 merchant cruisers has been provided.

The number of breech-loading guns was more than quadrupled after 1886. Large quick-firing guns and smokeless powder were introduced. British gun factories for the manufacture of heavy ordnance were developed and encouraged

PERSONNEL.

The *personnel* of the Navy was largely augmented to meet the increase in the number of ships in commission and building, and was to be ultimately raised to about 76,000 officers and men.

The number of men available to man the fleet was under Mr. Gladstone decreased by 700 between 1881 and 1886, while under the Conservative Government *the number was increased by* 13,000.

Mercantile marine officers were encouraged to join the Royal Naval Reserve, the number of the second-class reserve of seamen were raised, and steps were taken to encourage the formation of a reserve of firemen.

A scheme for the better technical education of naval officers was settled Another training ship for boys for the Navy was stationed in the Firth of Forth.

ORGANIZATION.

A *Naval Intelligence Department* was organized.

A plan for mobilising the Naval Reserves was adopted, and new arrangements were made for keeping the ships in reserve in a condition of effective preparedness.

Naval Manœuvres were instituted, for which a large number of additional vessels were annually mobilised.

The Channel Squadron was re-organized, and powerful new ironclads substituted for obsolete types; the *Mediterranean Squadron* was raised to a *force of ten powerful ironclads* and two armoured cruisers; and four sea-going ironclads (in commission) were substituted for the old wooden hulks as flagships for the Admirals commanding at the Home Ports.

Improved arrangements were made for coaling in peace and war. A chain of signal stations, connected by telegraph, round the coast of the United Kingdom were established.

FINANCE.

The form and arrangement of the Navy Estimates were so changed and improved that money is now voted directly to certain specific work, and under a new system of Audit it cannot (as formerly was the case) be otherwise used without the knowledge of Parliament.

From 1880 to 1885, under Mr. Gladstone's Government, 75 millions were spent on the Navy, exclusive of the cost of armament. Of that sum only *£11,350,000 went into new ships, or 15 per cent. on the whole expenditure.* Between 1886 and 1892 a sum of 87 millions was spent by Lord Salisbury's Government on the Navy, *of which 24 millions, or 27 per cent., went into new shipbuilding.*

Supplementary estimates, or votes of credit, to the extent of £7,672,000, a large portion of which was provided out of the sinking fund, and not out of taxation, were required by Mr. Gladstone's Government, while, under Lord Salisbury's Ministry the supplementary estimates amounted to only £819,000, the whole of which was met out of current taxation.

CONTRACTS WITH FOREIGNERS.

Under Lord Salisbury's Government the *whole amount of the contracts with foreigners* in the year ending March 31st, 1892, *was £39,000*, the bulk of which was for two articles—special mineral oil used in the navy for lubrication, and wood for small arms, neither of which can be readily obtained in England.—(*Parl Paper*, 172 of 1892).

In the six years ending in 1886, Mr Gladstone's Government purchased from foreign manufacturers goods to the value of £1,154,823. Among these were articles which could have been manufactured at home, such as salt pork (£132,000), zinc, black silk handkerchiefs, screws, preserved butter, silk braid, tents, preserved meat (£254,000), quick-firing guns, cavalry swords and scabbards (£20,000), and gunpowder (£343,000).—(*Parl. Paper*, 228 of 1886).

SUMMARY OF NAVAL IMPROVEMENTS.

The annual statement of the First Lord of the Admiralty shows the progress achieved in the Navy during the last six years.*

SHIPS (fighting) in commission:—	1886.	1892.
At home—excluding coast-defence ships, gun-boats and torpedo-boats	15	21
Displacement tonnage	110,000	154,000
Abroad—total of all classes	96	110
Displacement tonnage	205,800	300,007
Complements—abroad	18,100	23,350

* Parliamentary Paper, C. 6692, of 1892.

RESERVE SHIPS (ready for commission) :—		
Excluding coast-defence ships, gun-boats and torpedo-boats	10	19
Displacement tonnage	25,700	82,200
SHIPS of 15 knots speed and upwards (afloat and building), all classes except torpedo-boats	57	140
MEN :—Establishments of officer and men (Active list)	61,400	74,100
Royal Naval Reserve (officers and men...	18,300	23,500
GUNS, &c. :—B.-L. Guns (afloat & in reserve)	499	1,868
Lightquick-firing guns (afloat & in reserve)	33	1,715
Torpedoes (afloat and in reserve) ...	820	2,874

Appendix XXX.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS UNDER LORD SALISBURY.

The foreign policy of Lord Salisbury in the six years from 1886 to 1892 will long be remembered as one of vigilance, firmness, dignity and peace. Its effects were seen in the enormous extension of British influence in every quarter of the globe, and in the enhanced prestige of the British name among foreign nations. The most striking among the achievements of the Conservative Ministry in this department of their work are set forth below :—

EUROPE.

THE RUSSIAN DISPUTE.

When Mr. Gladstone left office in 1885, our relations with Russia, in consequence of the dispute as to the Afghan boundaries, were in a state of tension and unsettlement. Mr. Gladstone had obtained a Vote of Credit of Eleven Millions in preparation for war, and though the preliminaries of an agreement had been arrived at, the utmost tact and skill was necessary to prevent a rupture which would, in all probability, have entailed a European war. Lord Salisbury promptly took the matter in hand, and he was able to announce in the Queen's Speech, on January 21st, 1886, that the differences had been satisfactorily adjusted, and that a Commission had been appointed to mark out the frontiers of Afghanistan.

GREECE.

In 1890, a Commercial Treaty was arranged with Greece, as a result of which the import duties on British goods were largely reduced, and the volume of trade was greatly expanded.

ASIA.

CHINA.

A valuable Treaty was concluded with China in 1887, by which the relations of that country with our new dependency, Burmah, were placed on an amicable footing, and facilities are afforded for mutual trade.

AMERICA.

BEHRING'S SEA SEAL FISHERIES.

The differences relating to the rights of seal fishery in Behring's Sea, respecting which a long series of negotiations had taken place between the United States and Great Britain, resulted in 1891 in an agreement for the whole question to be referred to arbitration. An Act passed in that year gives the British Government power to restrain the action of the fishermen in the meantime, and a subsequent arrangement was (1892) made by which it was hoped that further difficulties may be removed.

CANADIAN FISHERIES.

In the year 1888 another dispute arose between the United States and Canadian fishermen, which was referred to a Commission, and a *modus vivendi* was arrived at, which has since been prolonged.

NEWFOUNDLAND.

Similar complications having grown up in reference to the respective rights of French, American, Canadian, and native fishermen on the coasts of Newfoundland, after long correspondence, and a period of great tension owing to the unwillingness of the Newfoundlanders to accept the proposals made to them, an arrangement was made with France, by which the dispute should go to arbitration. But for the attitude of the Gladstonian party in Parliament, which encouraged the French to delay the settlement, it might have been already carried into effect.

AUSTRALASIA.

NEW HEBRIDES.

A difficulty with France respecting the right of that country to land criminals in the New Hebrides was amicably settled in 1887, by the withdrawal of the French claims and the vindication of British rights.

SAMOA.

The condition of these islands, in consequence of a civil war, brought about in part by German Policy, had become a danger to English interests, and action was taken by Lord Salisbury in 1889 to restore peace and establish a settled Government. As an outcome of a conference between England, Germany, and the United States, the islands were acknowledged as independent, and the danger of future complications was minimised.

AFRICA.

The most remarkable and important results, however, of Lord Salisbury's foreign policy were in connection with the partition of the continent of Africa. *Five agreements were concluded with European powers*, the joint effect of which was to bring upwards *of Two million square miles of territory* under the British flag, and to extend British influence and the possibilities of civilization over a population estimated at nearly Twenty millions.

ANGLO-GERMAN AGREEMENT.

The most important of these Conventions was that made with Germany in 1890, by *which a Protectorate was secured over Zanzibar*, doubling the trade of the port within a year, and *a Million square miles of territory* were placed under British influence, and made available for British trade. In return for valuable concessions the island of Heligoland, only three-quarters of a square mile in size with 2,086 inhabitants, and of no practical use to England, was ceded to Germany, and an Act of Parliament was passed for the purpose, care being taken to safeguard the rights of the islanders, and to give them the opportunity, if they choose, to remain British subjects. Of this great stroke of policy Mr. Gladstone was constrained to admit the success, as well as the excellence of the means employed. He said: "*As to the African portion of the question I thinks* "*it my duty to give unqualified credit to Lord Salisbury for the spirit in which* "*he has set about this agreement. It is a good spirit*, having regard to the "best interests of England, and is also the spirit of one who did not wish to "view those interests in a narrow or selfish manner, but who desired, in the "discharge of this great colonising, protecting, or superintending function, that "the benefits should extend ungrudgingly to all countries in the world."—(*Hansard*, July 24th, 1890.)

ANGLO-FRENCH AGREEMENTS.

Two Conventions, arranged in 1889 and 1890, were made with France. The one settled the bounds of the respective possessions on the West Coast of Africa, the other defined the limits of the spheres of influence of the two countries in the Niger territories giving to great Britain access to Lake Tchad and control of the water-way of the river Niger. It further provided for the security of our missionaries in Madagascar, the French protectorate over that island being in return recognised by England.

ANGLO-ITALIAN AGREEMENT.

In North-East Africa, on the Red Sea coast, a similar settlement of the boundaries of the Italian and British possessions was amicably effected in 1891.

ANGLO-PORTUGUESE AGREEMENT.

In the early part of 1890, it became necessary to repel the claims of Portugal to interfere with the district of Nyassaland, where Scottish missionaries were settled, and to insist on the freedom of transit on the Zambesi. After a period of contention, the British rights were admitted by Portugal, and a definite agreement to prevent future misunderstandings was concluded in 1891.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS.

The results of Lord Salisbury's policy in Africa may be thus summed up:

We have obtained the largest and also the best share of the Continent, and the possession of four of the best river and trade routes:—(1) From the Red Sea to the Nile; (2) from the East Coast to the Upper Nile and Lakes; (3) three-fourths of the Zambesi; (4) from Cape Colony northwards; and (5) the Lower Niger, giving best access to the Western Soudan. A line can be drawn from the Cape to Alexandria all the way through the territories over which Great Britain will exercise influence, except where Lake Tanganyika (of which the navigation is free) divides the Congo State from German East Africa, and a small part of the latter intervenes to the north of it, over which a "right of way" has been secured.

We *have secured the central districts of South Africa*, being developed by the South African Company; the richest part of the Niger basin, administered by the Royal Niger Company; the country of the British East African Company, north of Zanzibar, with a sphere of influence from the great Lakes to Egypt; and *the Protectorate* of *Pemba* and of Zanzibar, a city of 100,000 people, and having a trade with the *British Empire of £2,000,000 sterling*.

EGYPT.

The policy of Lord Salisbury's Government in regard to Egypt was to afford every assistance to the native Government, and while maintaining the army of occupation at a minimum, to strengthen the Egyptian Government so that it may be able to stand alone, and the possibility of our withdrawal may be contemplated. The results of this policy may be summed up in a few words. *The finances* were reformed, and surpluses have taken the place of deficits; irrigation was extended, and its benefits fairly apportioned; a reliable army was created; justice is more purely administered; the "courbash" and forced labour were virtually abolished; the Dervish invasion was repelled; and immense progress was made in sanitation, education, the postal system, and the suppression of slavery.

THE SUEZ CANAL.

In the year 1888, a Convention of the Powers interested was held with the object of establishing the neutral character of the Canal in time of war. An agreement on the subject was arrived at, and the settlement of a great question left open by Mr. Gladstone's Government was effected. The freedom of the Canal at all times was guaranteed by agreement between the six countries primarily interested, and the through trade of the Canal has increased in an enormous degree.

THE SLAVE TRADE.

Lord Salisbury's Government did more than any preceding Ministry *to suppress the African Slave Trade*. One of their first acts was to arrange in 1887 a Convention with Germany and other Powers, by which plans of mutual action were agreed upon, and effective co-operation secured. This was followed up in 1889 by an International Conference, held at the instance of Great Britain, with the object of the general suppression of the Slave Trade. At this Conference important resolutions were arrived at for the purpose of regulating international action. The chief methods agreed upon as essential to the destruction of the traffic were these :—

1. The progressive organisation of the administrative, judicial, religious and military services in the territories placed under the sovereignty of protectorate of civilised nations.
2. The gradual establishment in the interior of strongly occupied European stations.
3. The construction of roads and railways, connecting the stations with the coast, so as to substitute economical and rapid means of transport for the present means of carriage by human, *i.e.* slave agency.
4. Establishment of steam-boats on the rivers and lakes, and the provision of telegraphs.
5. Organization of expeditions and flying columns, to keep up the communications, and to insure the security of high roads.
6. Restriction of the importation of fire-arms and ammunition.

These measures were of course, intended to be gradually introduced, but a first step towards their realization was taken in 1890, when, through British influence, the Sultan of Zanzibar was induced to issue a decree abolishing the slave traffic in his dominions. This was followed up in 1891 by a proposal to *grant a sum of money* to the East African Company for *experimental surveys for a railway from Mombasa to Lake Victoria, Nyanza*. The suggestion was, however, strongly opposed by the Gladstonian party, and was carried into effect by a large majority, (March 4th, 1892), *in spite of the hostility of Sir W. Harcourt and upwards of* 100 *Gladstonian members*.

Appendix XXXI.

LABOUR.

LABOUR COMMISSION.

The Government appointed in 1891 a Labour Commission, under the Chairmanship of the Duke of Devonshire, and manned by a large number of the ablest men in the Kingdom, to enquire into the relations between Capital and Labour, the causes and cure of strikes, and the general condition of the labouring classes. Several prominent Gladstonian members were offered seats on the Commission, but refused to serve; a course which was virtually condemned by Mr. Mundella, M.P., one of the Commissioners, who said:—

"If I had any doubt when I went on this Royal Commisson as to its necessity or value, I have none now."—(*March 23rd*, 1892.)

FOREIGN IMMIGRATION.

A Committee was appointed, at the instance of Sir John Colomb (1888), to conduct a careful enquiry (Sir W. Marriott, Chairman), into the extent of Foreign Immigration into England; the laws of foreign countries restricting admission of destitute aliens; and the desirability of introducing similar restrictions into our legislation. The Conservative Government were under pledges to deal with this question as early as possible, and in the meantime, the Board of Trade took steps to watch carefully the immigration of pauper aliens from foreign countries, and to obtain accurate statistics thereof. The number of such immigrants in the five months ending May, 1892, was 13,873, including only such as are "not stated to be *en route* to America."—(*Parl. Paper*, 6—IV. of 1892.)

Mr. Matthews, as Home Secretary, placed restrictions on the wholesale naturalisation of Foreigners by raising the certificate fee to £5.

Mr. Gladstone, however, opposed Mr. James Lowther's amendment to the address condemning unrestricted alien immigration on Feb. 11th, and defeated it. The present Gladstonian Government have done nothing practical as yet, except to refer the matter, as usual, to a small Commission.

SWEATING SYSTEM.

Lord Dunraven procured, in 1887, the appointment of a Committee on the Sweating System at the East End, which bore partial fruit in the Factories Act of 1891. (*q.v.*)

Papers issued by the Treasury (*Parl. Paper*, 189) detail the step taken by the Conservative Government to carry out the resolution of the House of Commons of February 13th, 1891, as follows:—"That, in the opinion of this House, it is the duty of the Government in all Government contracts to make provision against

the evils recently disclosed before the Sweating Committee, to insert such conditions as may prevent the abuse arising from sub-letting, and to make every effort to secure the payment of such wages as are generally accepted as current in each trade for competent workmen."

The Admiralty notified their contractors that "they expect those who are entrusted with contracts for the Admiralty to adhere to its conditions. My Lords will be compelled to consider the question of removing the names of all who fail to comply with the resolution from the list of those allowed to undertake the work for this department.

The Board of Trade imposed a penalty for contravention, thus:—"The contractor undertakes . . . . that no work shall be done at the home of the workpeople. Any infringement of this contravention, if proved to the satisfaction of the President of the Board of Trade, shall render the contractor liable to a penalty not exceeding £100 for each offence. . . . . No portion of this contract shall be transferred without the written permission of the President of the Board of Trade. Subletting, other than that which may be customary in the trades concerned, is prohibited."

Similar regulations were made by the Board of Customs, the Home Office, the Post Office, the Stationery Office, the War Office, and the Office of Works. The Office of Works, in addition, required contractors to specify the minimum and maximum rates of wages paid by them to each class of workmen.

FACTORY INSPECTION.

The Regulations for the appointment of Factory Inspectors were revised, so as to give advantages to Working Men Candidates, especially by extending the limit of age in their favour. A general scheme for recasting the districts is under consideration, including the question of the appointment of Female Inspectors was included in the inquiry to which he referred.

MINES.

Provisions were passed into law, whereby working Miners were made eligible for appointment as under-managers in coal mines, receiving a certificate as such for the first time.

Mining Royalties.—A Royal Commission, under the Chairmanship of Lord Northbrook, made extensive enquiries into the existing system of Royalties on Mines, and their bearing on the mining industry.

Coal Dust Explosions.—A Second Commission, under the Chairmanship of Mr. Chamberlain, prosecuted an enquiry into the best scientific methods of preventing these disastrous occurrences.

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES.

A Committee (Sir H. Maxwell, Chairman) investigated the position of Collecting Societies under the Act of 1875; and as a result, a Government Bill was brought in (1891), providing for the compulsory registration of such bodies, and also providing salutary restrictions on the insurance of infant life.

ELECTRIC LIGHTING.

Numerous provisional orders were sanctioned to provide for electric lighting in many large towns, and an enormous stimulus was given to the enterprise. During the year 1891, such orders were granted to the number of 59.

Appendix XXXII.

AGRICULTURAL LEGISLATION.

BOARD OF AGRICULTURE ACT, 1889 (Mr. W. H. Smith).

OBJECT.

To establish an Agricultural Department, with a Cabinet Minister at its head, charged specially with the care of agricultural interests.

MEANS.

The Board of Agriculture was established, with a Privy Councillor (Mr. Henry Chaplin), as President. Under its care was placed all business relating to Cattle Disease, the enclosure of Commons, Land Drainage and improvements, the Ordnance Survey, the Rabies Acts, and the Destructive Insects Acts. The collection of agricultural statistics, the inspection of agricultural schools, and the direction of experiments were also assigned to the Board.

* LABOURERS' ALLOTMENTS ACTS, 1887-90.

OBJECT.

To facilitate the provision of Allotments for the Labouring Classes.

MEANS.

The Act of 1887 empowers any six Parliamentary electors to petition the Local Sanitary Authority to take action to obtain land for Allotments. An enquiry is then held, and if it is considered that a *bona fide* demand exists, which cannot be met by voluntary arrangements, the Local Authority is required to buy or hire suitable land, and let it in Allotments to resident labourers. The purchase-money is to be fixed by voluntary agreement; but if land cannot be obtained at a fair rate it may be acquired compulsorily. The Sanitary Authority may make roads, drains, fences, &c., and regulations for the management of the Allotments. They must fix the rents at such a rate as will not cause loss to the district, and no Allotment is to exceed one acre. Allotment managers may be chosen by the local electors if they so desire.

The Act of 1890 gives an appeal to the County Councils against refusal by the Boards of Guardians to put the Act in operation, and enables the Councils to take over the duties of these authorities when necessary, and carry out the Act themselves.

RESULTS.

The number of allotments in England and Wales in 1886 was 357,795. In 1881 the number had risen to 478,000. Of the results of these Acts the *Rural*

World, of May, 6th, 1892, says: "We cannot state all the authorities which have put the Act into force, but within our own knowledge local authorities have in from 150 to 200 cases directly put the Allotments Act into operation. This does not mean 150 to 200 'labourers,' but places. It will be seen, therefore, that if our limited knowledge extends to this large number of cases, it is most probable a much greater number of authorities have directly put the Act into operation."

Model regulations for the management of Allotments have been drawn up and circulated by the Local Government Board.

ALLOTMENTS COMPENSATION ACT, 1887

(Sir E. Birkbeck).

The tenant is entitled under the Act to be paid by the owner money conpensation for growing crops, for labour expended, and manure applied since the last crop, and for drainage or structural improvements executed with the landlord's consent. In case of dispute, arbitration is provided for.

ALLOTMENTS RATING ACT, 1891 (Mr. H. Cust).

This Act provides that allotments are to be rated in regard to sanitary rates at *one-fourth their annual* value, putting them thereby in the same favourable position as arable land, woodlands, market gardens, &c.

* GLEBE LANDS ACT, 1888 (Mr. E. Stanhope).

To facilitate the sale of glebe lands for the public advantage.

The incumbent is authorised, with the assent of the Land Commission, to sell his glebe, and to invest the proceeds of the sale in Government or other approved securities. Special provisions are made for enabling the land to be sold in small parcels to labourers and cottagers, or to local authorities under the Allotments Acts.

* SMALL HOLDINGS ACT, 1892 (Mr. Chaplin).

OBJECT.

To encourage thrift and industry, and to promote comfort among the labouring classes in the country districts, by assisting them to buy small holdings of land on easy terms, the bulk of the purchase-money being advanced by the Government.

MEANS.

A "small holding" is defined as a quantity of land of more than one acre and not more than 50 acres; or a piece of land over 50 acres, but less than £50 a year in value.

The County Councils are empowered to provide moneys for the purchase of holdings up to the limit of one penny in the pound on the county rate. This sum is calculated to be about Ten Million Pounds. If necessary, the Government will lend to the County Councils the money, with which to acquire suitable land and adapt it for small holdings, draining, dividing, fencing, making roads, &c.

The County Council will then offer it for sale to the villagers. One-fifth of the value must be paid down in cash by the purchaser; one quarter may be turned into a perpetual rent charge redeemable at will; and the remainder will be payable by instalments spread over a term not exceeding fifty years.

A man who purchases land in this way will not usually be allowed to sub-let or sub-divide it during the first ten years, nor afterwards until he has paid off the purchase-money, and he must also cultivate it himself. One dwelling house will be allowed on each holding.

If a *parishioner* does not want to purchase, but *wishes to hire a small holding, the County Council will be able to purchase land and let it in lots of less than ten acres*; or, if a man already occupying and paying rent for a small holding wishes to buy it from his landlord, the County Council will be given power to advance him four-fifths of the purchase-money, if the land can be got at a reasonable price.

Thus means will be provided for the residents in rural districts to obtain land in three different ways :—

Aid to purchase small holdings up to fifty acres;

Aid to hire holdings up to ten acres, with a view to their ultimate purchase;

Aid to present tenants to purchase their holdings up to 50 *acres.*

This plan of the Conservative Government was the first practical step towards giving the labourers a permanent stake in the soil.

NOTE.—Mr. Gladstone, who is not remarkable for lavishing praise upon his opponents' legislation, said of this measure (March 24, 1892):—"I am very far "from objecting to the conduct of the Government in the production of this Bill. " . . . *I greatly rejoice to think that this Bill is an honest effort in the right direction.*"

* TITHE ACT, 1891 (SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH).

OBJECT.

To transfer the duty of paying tithe rent-charge from the occupier to the owner of land, and to provide simple means for its recovery.

The Act provides that tithe rent-charge shall be payable by the owner of the land, notwithstanding any contract between him and the occupier, and it renders void any contract between an occupier and owner after the passing of the Act, for the payment of the tithe by the former.

The 2nd section provides for the recovery of the tithe through the county court when it is three months in arrear; the order of the court to be executed by the appointment of a receiver, but not by imprisonment.

The Act has amply fulfilled its purpose, and has put an end to the disturbances in Wales and elsewhere, by which the collection of tithe rent-charge was formerly disgraced.

* PLEURO-PNEUMONIA ACT, 1890 (MR. CHAPLIN).

OBJECT.

To stamp out, if possible this highly infectious disease among cattle, and to compensate the owners for losses.

MEANS.

The Board of Agriculture is directed to cause the slaughter of all affected animals, and is also authorised to direct the slaughter of suspected animals. *Compensation is payable to the owners*, and a sum of £140,000 is set apart for the purpose.

RESULTS.

The stringent administration of the Act was attended with the best effect. It came into force in September, 1890. Up to that date the outbreaks every year had seldom been below 400, and often above 1,000; *in one year*, 1874, *there were* 3,200 *cases*. Since the Act has been enforced the numbers have declined rapidly. In 1890 the number of outbreaks was 484; in 1891 they fell to 192; *and in* 1892, up to May 31st, *there were only* 21 *cases;* and the average is now lower than at any time since the introduction of the disease into England, in 1842.

* MARGARINE ACT, 1887 (Sir R. Paget).

To prevent the fraudulent sale of margarine under the name of butter.

The Act protects the public against the sale of foreign substitutes as butter, by requiring that *all such substances*, classed by the general name of margarine; *shall be distinctly labelled in large letters* under a heavy penalty, and that every manufactory of margarine in the kingdom shall be registered.

That purchasers now know what they are buying, and English butter is no longer prejudiced by foreign substitutes sold under its name.

* MARKETS AND FAIRS ACTS, 1887-91 (Mr. Chaplin).

OBJECTS.

To enable farmers and others to buy or sell cattle by weight, and to require local authorities to make returns of sales, &c.

MEANS.

The local market authorities are bound to provide and maintain a place where cattle brought to market may be weighed, and any seller or purchaser may require the cattle to be weighed. They are also required to furnish statistics to the Board of Agriculture of the cattle entering the markets within their districts, together with the weights and prices.

TENANTS' COMPENSATION ACT, 1890

(Col. Cotton-Jodrell, C.).

The occupier is given, as against a mortgagee who takes possession, the same rights to compensation for improvements, &c., as against an ordinary owner, and also a right to have six months' notice to quit.

HARES PRESERVATION ACT, 1892 (Col. Dawnay).

By this Act the threatened extermination of the hare has been prevented. A close time, during the breeding season, has been provided for, and the preservation of an important article of food, and one which is of marketable value to the farmer, as been secured.

Appendix XXXIII.

CONSERVATIVE AGRICULTURAL ADMINISTRATION.

AN INTELLIGENCE DEPARTMENT

Was organised for the collection of statistics and the diffusion of information.

Leaflets were widely circulated among agriculturists, giving information as to injurious insects, improved methods of culture, precautions against disease, &c.

A special enquiry was made into the extent of woods and plantations in Great Britain, and grants have been given for the teaching of forestry.

Special enquiries were made into the damage to crops by the diamond-backed moth in the Eastern Counties, and by field mice on the hill grazings of Southern Scotland.

Scientific researches were conducted into various questions connected with dairy-farming, including the manufacture of Cheddar and Cheshire cheese.

Extended statistics were procured and published respecting crops and live-stock, the prices, imports, and exports of agricultural produce.

CATTLE DISEASE.

The meat supply was safeguarded by the effective exclusion of diseased cattle coming from infected countries.

Foot and Mouth Disease last broke out in 1880, when it attacked no less than 30,800 animals. The measures of prevention then in force were insufficient to cope with the plague, and in three months had only reduced it to one-fifth of its volume.

The outbreak in 1892 attacked 5,094 animals; but the superior promptness and activity which the powers of a special Department provides, in three months practically stamped out the contagion.

Rules were made to prevent cruelty to animals on ocean voyages, by requiring shipowners to provide proper pens, strongly built and floored, and enforcing the supply of sufficient light, ventilation, water, food, and attendants.

RABIES

Was almost stamped out by the issue of stringent regulations, by which the public security against hydrophobia has been greatly increased.

In 1889, 312 cases of Rabies were reported. On January 1st, 1890, a muzzling order was imposed by the Board of Agriculture in certain districts, and its effect was that the cases of *Rabies declined to 129 in 1890* and *to 69 in 1891:* while in 1892, up to May 31st, there had only been seven cases. In London alone there were 61 cases in 1889; 25 cases in 1890; 6 cases in 1891; and up to June, 1892, no single case has been reported. All that human agency could do to stamp out the disease was, therefore, done.

GRANTS

Were made to 31 Agricultural and Dairy Schools in various parts of the country. Grants were made for various special experiments, and in particular for experiments on the checking of potato disease.

MARKETS.

A Royal commission, under Lord Derby's Chairmanship, investigated the Market system and accommodation throughout the country, and recommended legislation on the subject.

COMMON LANDS

Were carefully regulated and protected in the interests of the public.

HORSE-BREEDING.

A standing Commission (Duke of Portland, Chairman) *was appointed* to encourage and improve the breeding of horses, and was furnished with funds for the purpose, which are employed for prizes at agricultural shows, and in assisting farmers to obtain the services of the best cart-horse sires.

TITHE RENT-CHARGE.

A Royal Commission (Lord Basing, Chairman) enquired into the question of the redemption of tithe rent-charge, and has made practical proposals with a view to legislation.

HOP INDUSTRY.

A Select Committee of the House of Commons was appointed in 1889, with the assent of the Government, to consider the depressed condition of the Hop Industry, and made recommendations for mitigating the effects of foreign competition.

PROGRESS SINCE 1886.

The progress of Agriculture in the last five years is shown in the following Table, taken from the *Agricultural Returns* for 1891 :—

The CULTIVATED AREA of the Kingdom in 1886 was (acres)	47,932,000
In 1891 it had increased to	48,179,000
The number of HORSES used in Agriculture in 1886 was	1,927,000
In 1891 it had risen to	2,026,000
The number of CATTLE in 1886 was	10,862,000
In 1891 it had increased to	11,343,000
The number of SHEEP in 1886 was	28,955,000
The same in 1891 numbered	33,533,000
The Stock of PIGS in 1886 numbered	3,497,000
In 1891 it stood at	4,272,000

APPENDIX XXXIV.

CONSERVATIVE MINES LEGISLATION.

COAL MINES REGULATION ACT, 1887 (Mr. MATTHEWS).

OBJECT.

To amend and consolidate the Acts of 1872 and 1886.

MEANS.

The principal amendments introduced into the law are:

The employment of boys under 12 is entirely prohibited ;

Payment of wages is regulated by actual weight of mineral ;

Half-yearly inspection of weights and measures is enforced ;

Check-weighers' employment is made independent of owners ;

Additional precautions are taken for ventilation ;

Increased safety is provided as regards lamps ;

Improved rules are made for blasting ;

Provision of proper timber close to the work is made obligatory ;

The employment of experienced engineers at shafts is enforced ;

Use of experienced men only at face of working is allowed ;

The powers of H.M. Inspectors are greatly increased.

RESULTS.

This Act was described by Mr. Burt, M.P., as "*the greatest measure of the kind "that had ever yet been passed by the British Parliament*," and, although he considered that it was not altogether perfect, he believed "it would do much to "protect life and limb, mitigate suffering, and lessen the still enormous and "terrible loss of life that occurred in connection with the mining industry."—(At Edinburgh, October 11th, 1887.)

Sir H. H. Vivian (Gladstonian M.P.). "I am bound to say that I have never known any Home Secretary.....who has endeavoured more earnestly to fulfil his very onerous duties of providing for the safety of the men in the mines of the country, than the right hon. gentleman the present Home Secretary (Mr. Matthews)."—August 19th, 1887.

Appendix XXXV.

FACTORIES AND WORKSHOPS.

FACTORIES & WORKSHOPS ACT, 1891 (Mr. Matthews).

OBJECT.

To improve the administration of the Factory Acts, and to provide further protection for the health and safety of the workers.

MEANS.

New and strict sanitary regulations are made for workshops and laundries, enforceable by local authorities.

"Special Rules" are provided for preventing evils arising from dangerous machinery, dangerous or unhealthy premises, defective ventilation or excessive heat.

Provisions are made for the prevention of excessive overtime, and for ensuring the payment of full wages for piece work.

The fencing of dangerous machinery, and proper means of escape from fire is made imperative.

The minimum limit of age for beginning work is increased to eleven years. (This provision was introduced by Mr. Sydney Buxton, L., and seconded by Sir W. Houldsworth, C.)

Finally, the powers of inspectors are enlarged, and increased penalties provided, so that the law may be properly enforced in the interests of the workers.

RESULTS.

An additional Inspector was appointed to supervise the execution of the Act as regards the textile trades. Prosecutions for false descriptions, under Section 24, have been effectively and successfully conducted, with the result of suppressing fraudulent practices on the part of a few unscrupulous employers.

The best testimony, however, to the success of the Act is the language of the operative leaders, as follows:—

Mr. T. Birtwistle, secretary of the United Textile Factory Workers, "*I may "say that Act contains many clauses which will be of the utmost importance to "factory workers, especially to weavers.* It will affect the earnings of winders "alone in the Burnley district (and we have every reason to believe it will affect others in equal proportion) to the extent of preventing them from being defrauded out of £93 per week, or £4,650 per year; and all other piece-workers in the weaving department will be similarly benefited."—*Times*, January 16th, 1892.

Mr. J. Mawdsley, Member of the Royal Commission on Labour, and General Secretary of Amalgamated Society of Cotton Spinners, said (Manchester, 29th Sept., 1891) "The cotton operatives of Manchester have *generally found a Conservative Government more friendly to them* than a Liberal Government, and furthermore that Conservative employers, as a rule, are more generous and more kindly to their men than are Liberal employers."

Mr. Burt, M.P., described these Acts as "some of the most beneficial legislation of our time." (Dec. 2, 1890).

COTTON-CLOTH FACTORIES ACT, 1889

(Viscount Cranborne).

OBJECT.

To protect the health of workpeople in cotton-cloth factories, by preventing the introduction of excessive moisture into the air.

MEANS.

Technical regulations are made to prohibit the artificial introduction of moisture above a degree authorised by the Home Secretary. Provision is made for the compulsory use of proper thermometers, and for the due execution of the Act by the Factory Inspectors.

RESULTS.

Two special Inspectors have been appointed to carry out the Act, and the reports on its working are very satisfactory.

THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE FACTORY ACTS.

The Radicals are trying to make capital out of the action of Mr. Asquith in enforcing the provisions of the great Factory Act passed by the Conservative Government in 1891.

MR. ASQUITH ON HIS OWN MERITS.

Speaking at Liverpool on January 20th, 1893, Mr. Asquith said concerning the Act:—

"*I found that Act nominally in force, but that its provisions were to a large extent a dead letter.* In the first place I issued an order, which the Act empowers me to do, requiring the employers in a large number of trades in which the practice of sweating commonly prevails, to keep lists of all their contractors and outworkers, and thereby to enable both the factory inspector and the sanitary inspector to track to their homes, or rather, I ought to say, to their dens, the lowest, the most degraded, and the most suffering classes of our industrial population."

No doubt it is creditable of Mr. Asquith to take such active steps, but that is no reason why he should be so unfair to his predecessor, in whose steps he was simply following. For the Act, though it only came into operation on January 1, 1892, and though Mr. Matthews was only in office for a few months afterwards, had already been widely enforced before Mr. Asquith succeeded him.

A FEW PLAIN FACTS.

No one would have supposed, from what Mr. Asquith said, that Mr. Henry Matthews had done anything to require lists of contractors and outworkers under the powers which his own Act of 1891 gave him. *The fact, however, is that he did make an order requiring these lists to be kept in the very industry which the House of Lords' Committee showed to be the especial hunting-ground of the sweater. Mr. Matthews' order applies, without exception, to every*

single contractor and outworker employed in "the manufacture of articles of wearing apparel" of all kinds whatsoever without exception. These words are quoted without alteration. from the schedule of the order, dated July 18th, 1892, which may be read at large, in the *London Gazette* of July 22nd, 1892. Besides all this, in May of 1892, Mr. Matthews declared under the Act of 1891 the following trades to be injurious to health, namely:—"Processes in the manufacture of white lead, processes in the manufacture of paints and colours and the extraction of arsenic, and processes in the enamelling of iron plates." In due course, and after the negotiations required by the Act, special rules were issued by him. Moreover, in June, 1892, Mr. Matthews declared injurious to health, and in August made special rules for, the manufacture of lucifer matches from white phosphorus.

Moreover, Mr. Asquith himself confessed in a speech at the Home Office, on January 24th, 1892:—

"At the beginning of last year, there were 59 inspectors for the whole of Great Britain and Ireland, that is, for factories, not mines. My predecessor, Mr. Matthews, in the course of the early months of that year, perceiving the inadequacy of the staff to deal with the duties imposed upon it, recommended to the Treasury an addition in all, including Mr. Birtwistle, appointed under the Particulars clause, of 10 to the staff. And the consequence was that when I came into office in August last I found a staff, existing and authorised, of 69 Inspectors. That is a very great improvement, the appointment of 10 in one year. (Hear, hear.) *I am sure you will all be ready to give as I do—because this is not a party question—the credit due to Mr. Matthews for effecting that great and useful change.*"—*Daily News*, January, 25th.

And yet a few days before Mr. Asquith had said that he "found the Act *nominally* in force," in order to glorify his own administration by belittling that of his predecessor!

A RECORD OF MR. MATTHEWS' WORK.

Speaking at Huddersfield on January 26th, Mr. Stuart-Wortley, M.P. (late Under-Secretary at the Home Office), said:—

The quality of the administration and the provisions of the laws to be administered have been constantly improved by successive Parliaments, by Conservative even more than by liberal Ministries. *Mr. Matthews increased the number of factory inspectors by 15 in all*, inclusive of the 10 for which Mr. Asquith yesterday gave him credit. *Mr. Matthews also increased the number of the mines inspectors. He made a large number of appointments of working men to posts of both kinds.* He revised the scheme of qualifying examinations for Factory Inspectorships, so as to make them more likely to admit men of practical knowledge. He appointed without examination the leader of the biggest trade union in the textile trades an inspector for the special purpose of enforcing what is known as the "Particular" clause of the Factory Act of 1891. (Cheers.) He appointed a Royal Commission, with a working man M.P. on it, to enquire into the obscure but supremely important subject of the action of coal dust in producing or aggravating explosions in mines.

These are facts! In the face of them, is it fair or honest to say that the Conservatives neglect the interests of the workers?

APPENDIX XXXVI.

RAILWAYS AND CANALS.

* RAILWAYS AND CANAL TRAFFIC ACT, 1888

(SIR M. HICKS-BEACH).

OBJECTS.

To prevent unfair rates on home produce, and to establish a judicial tribunal for settling disputes.

MEANS.

A Railway and Canal Commission was constituted, with large powers for ordering traffic facilities, settling disputes affecting tolls, rates, &c., and preventing undue preference.

Every Railway Company was obliged to submit a revised classification of goods traffic, and a revised schedule of rates and charges, for consideration by the Board of Trade, and ultimate sanction by Parliament.

RESULTS.

Revised classifications and shedules of rates of all the Railway Companies in the United Kingdom have now been determined, and it will be, for the future, possible for any trader by reference to one Act of Parliament, to ascertain the maximum powers of any Railway Company. A volume is in course of preparation, setting out all the maximum rates for the United Kingdom, and it will be necessary to consult this only instead of many hundreds of volumes of clauses. The rates of the Canal Companies are being discussed, and sixty-one schedules are under revision.

* REGULATION OF RAILWAYS ACT, 1889

(SIR M. HICKS-BEACH).

OBJECT.

To promote the public safety by compelling the adoption of the block system, efficient brakes, and interlocking points and signals, and by *discouraging the employment of railway servants for excessive overtime.*

MEANS.

The Board of Trade are empowered to order the adoption of the block system, &c., within a certain time to be fixed by them. The *Companies are also required to make periodical returns of the amount of overtime worked by their servants* in charge of trains and passengers, and penalties are imposed for default.

THE RAILWAY HOURS COMMITTEE.

The returns presented to Parliamant through the requirements of this Act led to a discussion in the House of Commons, Jan., 23, 1891, when Mr. CHANNING moved a vague resolution to empower the Board of Trade to issue orders to the companies directing them to limit the hours of work of special classes of railway servants, or to increase their number. No suggestion was made as to how the resolution could be carried out, nor was any hint given as to what the regulations should be. Sir Michael Hicks-Beach shewed that the Board had not the means to carry it out, and while expressing the sympathy of the Government, offered to accept a practical resolution in its stead. Mr. Channing and his friends, however, refused to withdraw, and the motion was negatived.

A day or two afterwards Sir Michael Hicks-Beach proposed the appointment of a Committee to consider the question, shewing thereby the bonâ fides of the position he had taken up. The Committee made its Report in 1892, and *recommended practical steps for reducing the hours of labour by means of indirect pressure on the few delinquent companies*, through the medium of the Railway Commission.

The Act was admitted by one Railway Manager to have already largely reduced the hours of labour. (Mr. Birt, Great Eastern Railway; evidence before the Railway Committee, 1891.) Mr. John Burns addressing railway men at Camden Town, Jan. 17. 1892, also admitted that the measures of the *Government "had caused the companies to reduce hours on all sides*—aye, and increase wages too."—*The Trade Unionist.*

Appendix XXXVII.

CONSERVATIVE PROTECTION OF SAILORS.

* MERCHANT SHIPPING ACTS, 1888-9

(Sir M. Hicks-Beach.)

OBJECT.

To increase the securities against loss of life at sea, and to protect the interests of masters and seamen of merchant ships.

MEANS.

By the Act of 1888 the duty is imposed on owners and masters of *ships to see that they are provided with such boats, life-jackets, &c., as are best adapted for the safety of crews and passengers.* A Committee containing representatives of owners, builders, masters of ships, seamen, and under-writers was entrusted with the duty of preparing rules under the Act.

By the Act of 1889, masters are enabled to recover disbursements properly made by them on behalf of the ship in the same way wages. *The "advance note" for seamen is legalised up to the extent of one month's wages, but not further;* and if they are paid in foreign money rules are made to ensure their receiving full value.

RESULTS.

The Consultative Committee, representating various interests, was formed by the Board of Trade, to frame rules for compelling the adoption of improved appliances, and the rules came into force in November, 1890. There effect is to require that some life-saving appliance is to be provided for *every person* on board a sea-going vessel.

* SEA FISHERIES ACT, 1888 (Sir M. Hicks-Beach).

MEANS.

The Board of Trade were authorised to constitute fishery districts, in which local tribunals representing all interests are to be set up, who will have powers to settle disputes, fix local "close times," and promote the general interests of the fisheries.

* NORTH SEA FISHERIES ACTS, 1888-91

(Sir M. Hicks-Beach.)

OBJECT.

To put an end to the infamous treatment of North Sea fishermen by foreign traders in intoxicating liquors.

MEANS.

The Hague Convention of 1887 provided that steps should be taken by each country to put down the illicit liquor traffic at the North Sea fisheries. The Acts, therefore, impose penalties on any British subject who sells or exchanges spirituous liquour to the fishermen, and provide ready means for the settlement of disputes between fishermen of the respective countries.

RESULTS.

The traffic of the "copers," as the smuggling traders were called, has received a wholesome check.

An agreement of much practical value was entered into under which the Belgian Government undertook to recover compensation for British fishermen when their boats or gear were injured by Belgian fishermen, and this agreement was put in force by the Act of 1891.

* FISHING BOATS ACT, 1887 (Baron H. de Worms).

OBJECT.

To amend the provisions of the Merchant Shipping Acts in regard to fishing boats.

MEANS.

The Act extends to the skippers of fishing boats the same advantages and protection in their dealings with owners as are enjoyed by ordinary seamen. It also requires that a certificated second in command shall go with every trawler above 25 tons, and give the Board of Trade power to hold enquiries into accidents to fishing boats which involve loss of life.

Appendix XXXVIII.

CONSTRUCTIVE CONSERVATIVE REFORMS.

The Government put forward, through Mr. Balfour, in June, 1892, a solid programme of future legislation. Let Unionists remember that these are no empty promises made by Gladstonians who bring with them no character from their last place, and who are terribly hampered because their leader insists on attempting the impossible in Ireland, before touching any social reforms of practical utility. Mr. Balfour's speech at St. James' Hall on June 15, 1892, and his election address contained a list of measures which the Conservative party are prepared to bring forward if they are again trusted with power. These measures are:—

1.—Reform of registration laws.

2.—As to ground-rents and rates, such an amendment in the law as, without breach of existing contracts, "would bring into the net of taxation, every species of property which benefits by taxation."

3.—As to labour, "I think that every public body—be it a Town Council, a County Council, or the State itself—should act towards the labour it employs in *the spirit of the most liberal and the most enlightened employer of labour*, and I rejoice to think that it is under the present Government that that principle has been extended to the administration of our spending department."

4.—*An Irish Local Government Bill* which shall give to Ireland privileges equal to those possessed by other parts of the United Kingdom, with reasonable safeguards against an unjust and oppressive use of such privileges.

5.—*A continuation and development of that generous and useful policy of public works* (by grants, guarantees, or loans in aid of light railways and other local

enterprises) which has already conferred so much benefit on poor districts in the West of Ireland, a policy which will do more for the permanent prosperity of Ireland than a thousand Parliaments established in Dublin.

6.—*A similar policy in favour of the poor crofters and fishermen* living under similar conditions on the west coast of Scotland.

7.—*As to Parliamentary Reform*, if this question be raised, it will be dealt with as a whole, *redressing the present inequalities of representation* as far as practicable, and redistributing the number of representatives on a more equitable basis among the different constituencies.

8.—*As to employers' liability* for injuries to their workmen, a measure founded upon the forthcoming report of the Labour Commission appointed by the present Government, abolishing the anomalies of the existing law and placing the relations of employer and employed upon an equitable footing.

9.—*A system of District Councils*, as a complement to the County Councils established by the present Government, and extending to smaller areas the principle of local self-government.

10.—*Extension*, as far as possible, *of the ownership of land, in the hands of small yeomen*, in addition to the successful legislation by the present Government which has already so greatly increased the allotments of land to agricultural labourers.

11.—*Sympathetic efforts to save the industrious and sober poor*, especially among the rural classes, from the rates or the Workhouse, whether through the Friendly Societies, or by co-operation with the Friendly Societies, or by a great extension of private energy and charity, but "by no means excluding State assistance," if it can be given without discouraging thrift or drying up the sources of private benevolence.

12.—*An improved system of classification and management in Workhouses*, by largely extending the area of Workhouse administration, with a view to the better treatment of the industrious, sober, and thrifty but unfortunate poor.

13.—As in the past, so in the future—a continued regard for the maintenance of the law and of individual liberty.

14.—*A prudent and courageous conduct of foreign affairs.*

15.—*Careful provision for the defences of the Empire.*

16.—*The State finances managed again with statesmanlike forthought* by the most skilful and successful of living English financers.

Here is a sketch of work which, as Mr. Balfour put it, "touches "every citizen, and especially the labouring classes, in their "nearest and dearest interests."

Appendix XXXIX.

PARNELL COMMISSION, FEBRUARY, 1890.

The charges brought by the *Times* newspaper against Mr. Parnell and certain other Irish members of Parliament have been declared by three judges appointed by Parliament under the Special Commission Act, 1888, to have been proved in the following cases:—

PLOTTING SEPARATION.

The Report states (p. 32):—

That some of the Parnellite Members of Parliament, "together with Mr. Davitt, established and joined in the Land League organisation with the intention by its means to bring about the absolute independence of Ireland as a separate nation. We think that this has been established against the following among the respondents:—Mr. Davitt, Mr. M. Harris, M.P., Mr. Dillon, M.P., Mr. W. O'Brien, M.P., Mr. W. Redmond, M.P., Mr. J. O'Connor, M.P., Mr. Joseph Condon, M.P., and Mr. J. J. O'Kelly, M.P."

CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY TO COERCE AND INTIMIDATE.

The Report states (p. 54):—

"In our judgment the leaders of the Land League who combined together to carry out the system of boycotting were guilty of a criminal conspiracy, one of the objects of which was (as stated in the second charge) by a system of coercion and intimidation to promote an agrarian agitation against the payment of agricultural rents for the purpose of impoverishing and expelling from the country the Irish landlords, who were styled the English garrison.

"We consider that this charge has been established against the following respondents:—

C. S. Parnell, M.P.
John Dillon, M.P.
Joseph G. Biggar, M.P.
Thomas Sexton, M.P.
T. P. O'Connor, M.P.
M. Harris, M.P.
W. O'Brien, M.P.
T. D. Sullivan, M.P.
T. M. Healy, M.P.
Tim Harrington, M.P.
Ed. Harrington, M.P.
A. O'Connor, M.P.
Jos. E. Kenny, M.P.
W. Redmond, M.P.
J. E. Redmond, M.P.
Justin McCarthy, M.P.
J. O'Connor, M.P.
Th. Jos. Condon, M.P.
J. J. O'Kelly, M.P.
Andrew Cummins, M.P.
Jos. R. Cox, M.P.
Patrick O'Hea, M.P.
Jeremiah D. Sheehan, M.P.
James Leahy, M.P.
Edward Leamy, M.P.
John Barry, M.P.
Dr. Tanner, M.P.
Morris Healy, M.P.
Thomas Quinn, M.P.
Danl. Crilly, M.P.
Henry Campbell, M.P.
Patk. J. Foley, M.P.
J. J. Clancy, M.P.
J. F. K. O'Brien, M.P.
R. Lalor, M.P.
Thos. Mayne, M.P.
Jno. Deasey, M.P.
J. C. Flynn, M.P.
Jeremiah Jordan, M.P.
W. J. Lane, M.P.
D. Sheehy, M.P.
Donald Sullivan, M.P.
Garrett M. Byrne, M.P.
Michael Davitt."

The expression "the respondents" applies to all those named above, as well as to—

J. Gilhooly, M.P.
John Hooper, M.P.
J. E. O'Doherty, M.P.
Michael McCartan, M.P.
Sir Thos. Edmonde, Bart., M.P.
John Stack, M.P.
Dennis Kilbride, M.P.
Dr. J. F. Fox, M.P.
M. Conway, M.P.
L. P. Hayden, M.P.
W. Abraham, M.P.
T. Finneane, M.P.
F. A. O'Keefe, M.P.
Joseph Nolan, M.P.
T. P. Gill, M.P.
Patrick O'Brien, M.P.
P. J. O'Brien, M.P.
Matthew J. Kenny, M.P.
J. D. Pyne, M.P.
P. J. Power, M.P.
James Tuite, M.P.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS.

We have now pursued our inquiry over a sufficiently extended period to enable us to report upon the several charges and allegations which have been made against the respondents, and we have indicated in the course of this statement our findings upon these charges and allegations, but it will be convenient to repeat seriatim the conclusions we have arrived at upon the issues which have been raised for our consideration.

I. We find that the respondent Members of Parliament collectively were not members of a conspiracy having for its object to establish the absolute independence of Ireland, but we find that some of them, together with Mr. Davitt, established and joined in the Land League organization with the intention by its means to bring about the absolute independence of Ireland as a separate nation.

II. We find that the respondents did enter into a conspiracy by a system of coercion and intimidation to promote an agrarian agitation against the payment of agricultural rents, for the purpose of impoverishing and expelling from the country the Irish landlords, who were styled the "English Garrison."

III. We find that the charge that "when on certain occasions they "thought it politic to denounce, and did denounce certain crimes in public, "they afterwards led their supporters to believe such denunciations were not "sincere," is not established. We entirely acquit Mr. Parnell and the other respondents of the charge of insincerity in their denunciation of the Phœnix Park murders, and find that the "fac-simile" letter on which this charge was chiefly based, as against Mr. Parnell, is a forgery.

IV. We find that the respondents did disseminate the "Irish World" and other newspapers tending to incite to sedition and the commission of other crime.

V. We find that the respondents did not directly incite persons to the commission of crime other than intimidation, but that they did incite to intimidation, and that the consequence of that incitement was that crime and outrage were committed by the persons incited. We find that it has not been proved that the respondents made payments for the purpose of inciting persons to commit crime.

VI. We find as to the allegation that the respondents did nothing to prevent crime, and expressed no *bonâ fide* disappoval, that some of the respondents, and in particular Mr. Davitt, did express *bonâ fide* disapproval of crime and outrage, but that the respondents did not denounce the system of intimidation which led to crime and outrage, but persisted in it with knowledge of its effect.

VII. We find that the respondents did defend persons charged with agrarian crime, and supported their families, but that it has not been proved that they subscribed to testimonials for, or were intimately associated with notorious criminals, or that they made payments to procure the escape of criminals from justice.

VIII. We find as to the allegation that the respondents made payments to compensate persons who had been injured in the commission of crime, that they did make such payments.

IX. As to the allegation that the respondents invited the assistance and co-operation of and accepted subscriptions of money from known advocates of crime and the use of dynamite, we find that the respondents did invite the assistance and co-operation of and accepted subscriptions of money from

Patrick Ford, a known advocate of crime and the use of dynamite, but that it has not been proved that the respondents, or any of them, knew that the Clan-na-Gael controlled the League, or was collecting money for the Parliamentary Fund. It has been proved that the respondents invited and obtained the assistance and co-operation of the Physical Force party in America, including the Clan-na-Gael, and in order to obtain that assistance, abstained from repudiating or condemning the action of that party.

There remain three specific charges against Mr. Parnell, namely :—

(*a.*) "That at the time of the Kilmainham negotiations Mr. Parnell knew that Sheridan and Boyton had been organising outrage, and therefore wished to use them to put down outrage."

We find that this charge has not been proved.

(*b.*) "That Mr. Parnell was intimate with the leading Invincibles, that "he probably learned from them what they were about when he was released "on parole in April 1882, and that he recognised the Phœnix Park murders as "their handiwork."

We find that there is no foundation for this charge. We have already stated that the Invincibles were not a branch of the Land League.

(*c.*) "That Mr. Parnell, on 23rd January, 1883, by an opportune remittance enabled F. Byrne to escape from justice to France."

We find that Mr. Parnell did not make any remittance to enable F. Byrne to escape from justice.

The two special charges against Mr. Davitt, viz. : (*a.*) "That he was a "member of the Fenian organization, and convicted as such, and that he "assisted in the formation of the Land League with money which had been "contributed for the purpose of outrage and crime ; (*b.*) "That he was in "close and intimate association with the party of violence in America, and "was mainly instrumental in bringing about the alliance between that party "and the Parnellite and Home Rule Party in America;" are based on passages in the "Times" leading articles of the 7th and 14th March, 1887. "The new movement was appropriately started by Fenians out of Fenian "funds; its 'father' is Michael Davitt, a convicted Fenian." "That Mr. "Parnell's 'constitutional organization' was planned by Fenian brains, "founded on a Fenian loan, and reared by Fenian hands."

We have shown in the course of the report that Mr. Davitt was a member of the Fenian organization, and convicted as such, and that he received money from a fund which had been contributed for the purpose of outrage and crime, viz., the Skirmishing Fund. It was not, however, for the formation of the Land League itself, but for the promotion of the agitation which led up to it. We have also shown that Mr. Davitt returned the money out of his own resources.

With regard to the further allegation that he was in close and intimate association with the party of violence in America, and mainly instrumental in bringing about the alliance between that party and the Parnellite and Home Rule Party in America, we find that he was in such close and intimate association for the purpose of bringing about, and that he was mainly instrumental in bringing about the alliance referred to.

ALL WHICH WE HUMBLY REPORT TO YOUR MAJESTY.

JAMES HANNEN.
JOHN C. DAY.
ARCHIBALD L. SMITH.

HENRY HARDINGE CUNYNGHAME,
Secretary.

Royal Courts of Justice,
13th February, 1890.

[REPORT, pp. 119—121.

Appendix XL.

AN APPEAL TO NONCONFORMISTS.

The following letter appeared in "The Times," of July 1st, 1892.

Sir,—Having learned that reports are circulated to the effect that I have "recanted my views as to the Union," I beg your permission to say that I should regard such a recantation as a real fall from a testimony faithfully borne. Some of my reasons are as follows :—

The Union is the form of Government that divides us least. This is proved, both as to Scotland and Ireland. As between Scot and Scot, also as between Scot and Southern, civil wars never ceased till 40 years after the Union. Now for a century and a half war has not been known. As between Irishman and Irishman, also as between Ireland and England, civil wars never ceased till the Union. Then they ceased at once ; and 90 years have passed over without one. Never before of Ireland could that be said ; nor can it be said since the date of the union of France, of Spain or Portugal, of Germany, or even of Switzerland.

When compared with the sanguinary battles which, since our Union, the autonomist aspirations of the Parisians have occasioned in that one city, all the broils in Ireland, sometimes called rebellions, have been affairs of local police. This is largely due to the fact that—

The Union saves us from two rival Parliaments and two rival Executives. Undo the settlement which secures to us this great deliverance, and conflict not of words only, but of blows, will follow.

The Union saves us from a war of tariffs. Set up Home Rule, and if you forbid the Irish Parliament to levy its own taxes, you furnish a standing provocation to conflict. If you permit it to levy them, English goods will be taxed, and Irish ones blessed, as of old, with bounties. A tax on imported flax would shut up the mills at Belfast. If the last 90 years prove that the Union is the Government which divides us least, the first seven years of Home Rule would prove that it is the Government which divides us most.

The Union protects capital, and consequently favours employment. In those tracts of the country where the guides of the people have not trained them to hate England, but to keep the law, and work six days in the week, capital accumulates, towns grow, and the labourer is not driven away to underbid fellow-labourers on other fields ; but his good wages year by year encourage others to come to his side, and often he makes his way well up. At the date of the Union Belfast had some four looms weaving linen ; such few factories as then existed having had cotton for their staple. Belfast has not had either iron or coal, either naval expenditure or patronage of Transatlantic steamers ; *yet at present it pays more customs duties than even Glasgow, coming next after London and Liverpool.* Derry is at present twice as populous as Belfast at the time of the Union. Lisburn, Carrickfergus, Portadown, Ballymena, Lurgan, and other towns in the North show a steady increase of hard-working inhabitants. Set up Home Rule, and capital will flee, employment will shrink, and the willing working man will have to go somewhere and underbid some one.

The Union is the only Government which can prevent a religious ascendency of some party in Ireland. It was hoped that the Protestant ascendency which existed at the time of the Union would under it come to an end. It did come to an end.

Before the Union the Liberals of Ulster had made Catholic emancipation, and "a real representation of the people in Parliament," the two demands of the United Irishmen, until the disloyal members of that body led it on into hostilities to "the English connexion." At the time of Disestablishment, the Liberals of Ulster in Belfast, Carrickfergus, and other places elected men to vote for it.

Were it proposed to-day to place the Irish Roman Catholics under disabilities, to tax them for Protestant purposes, to deprive them of an equal share in the franchise, or such like, the Irish Protestants would resist it. They want no restoration of the old ascendency. Those who think otherwise know them not One of the happy works of the Imperial Parliament was the ending of that ascendency, and only the Union can prevent the rise of a new ascendency, which would be that of the Roman Catholic Bishops. Against this Unionists, Protestants, and Roman Catholics protest; the Protestants because to them it would be unjust and oppressive; the Catholics because they do not want to see injustice or oppression, and because also they believe that the state of things which would arise would not in the long run bring honour to their own Church. Now, the Unionists, if in number the smaller party, are at the same time the stronger party, which the Lord grant that they may never have occasion to prove! It is evident that as the Irish Unionists would not allow of the re-establishment of the old ascendency, so they will not submit to establishment of a new one.

To me, as a Nonconformist, deeply convinced that a minister of the Gospel ought not to accept of his support from any source but voluntary contributions, and that no branch of the Church of Christ ought to accept from the State any preference in national law, it is not only bewildering, but very distressing, to find men who would stand with me in resisting any measure *which should tend virtually to place at the discretion of a Legislature, mostly composed of nominees of the Anglican Bishops, the religious liberties of the English Nonconformists*—to find such men working for a measure which *would place both the civil and religious liberties of Irish Protestants at the discretion of a Legislature mostly composed of nominees of the Roman Catholic Bishops.*

If there is any Nonconformist who did, as I did, read with minute care every word of evidence reported by the Special Commission, as given by an Archbishop and other Roman Catholic clergymen, and who, after so doing, would vote for Home Rule, I do, with deep feeling say—May a merciful Providence grant that my civil and religious liberties may never be in his keeping!

Men who have to judge only upon information coloured by party journals and the speeches of politicians, take upon themselves a tremendous responsibility in putting their Irish fellow-Protestants to the alternative of either bending to an episcopal ascendency, and that in no mild form, or else of resisting by force.

As they at present stand those Protestants have in the Union a perfect guarantee of their religious liberties. Set up Home Rule, and that perfect guarantee is gone. The one proposed in place of it is of questionable value. Now, to me, the Nonconformist who asks a brother Christian to part with a perfect guarantee of his civil and religious liberties in exchange for one of questionable value has, in so far, forgotten the principles of Nonconformity.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

WM. ARTHUR.

Glenmachan Tower, Strandtown, Co. Down, June 28th.

Appendix XLI.

THE IRISH NONCONFORMISTS' APPEAL.

The following letter appeared in the *Rural World* of March 11th, 1892 :—

Sir,—We, the undersigned Irish Non-Episcopal Ministers, desire, through your widely-read paper, to draw the attention of our Nonconformist brethren in England to our attitude towards Home Rule for Ireland.

Almost every one of the 990 Non-Episcopal ministers in Ireland is opposed to Mr. Gladstone's scheme, or any other scheme which would establish a Parliament in Dublin possessing legislative and executive authority.

The events which have occurred in Ireland since 1886 have strengthened us, and the Churches of which we are ministers, in our determined opposition to a Dublin Parliament.

The recent struggle between the Parnellites and M'Carthyites have impressed us more strongly than ever with the tremendous influence exercised by the Irish priesthood—an influence which would be paramount in a Dublin Parliament. The effects of such clerical interference in the sphere of politics in other countries confirm us in the judgment that under a Home Rule Government the interests and liberties of the Irish people, and especially the Irish Protestants, would be insecure.

The struggle between Catholics and Protestans would be intensified, and the eventual result would be the all-but certainty of civil war of a most sanguinary character.

Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule Scheme we hold to be at once degrading to us as citizens and dangerous to the interests of the Empire.

Our interests, and the interests of our people, are secure in the keeping of the Imperial Parliament; and we have no grievances which the Imperial Parliament does not show itself willing to remedy.

We claim the aid of our brethren in England and Wales, in our resistance of Mr. Gladstone's policy—a policy which we hold to be one of surrender and despair; and *we appeal with the utmost confidence to the descendants of the Nonconformists of* 1662 to put an

end at the coming general election, for at least a generation, to attempts such as Mr. Gladstone has made to disintegrate and destroy the unity and the glory of the Empire and Queen.

N. M. BROWN, D.D., Presbyterian,
R J. LYND, D.D., Presbyterian.
JOHN JAMES M'CLURE, Presbyterian.
GEORGE CRON, Independent.
WILLIAM USHER, M.D., Baptist.
WESLEY GUARD, Methodist.

Dr. N. M. Brown was the Moderator (or Chairman) for the year 1892 of the General Assembly—the Supreme Court—of the Irish Presbyterian Church, which numbers over half a million of the people of Ireland. He is a Radical, and is and was a tenant-righter long before the majority of Nationalists had dreamed of such a thing as tenant-right. Dr. Lynd is an ex-Moderator of the General Assembly, and probably the most eloquent non-Episcopal minister in Ireland. He has been a Liberal all his days. Mr. Wesley Guard is an eloquent Wesleyan Methodist and is representative of the Methodist community. Dr. Usher is the foremost Baptist pastor in Belfast. and is entitled to speak for the Baptist community. Mr. Cron is an Independent minister of ability, and is a well-known man in Belfast. Mr. M'Clure is Secretary of the Presbyterian Representation Association, and well known for his thorough knowledge of Irish affairs.—[C.C.O. No. 78.]

Appendix—XLII.

DEFENCE OF THE CHURCH IN WALES.

1.—The Church in Wales is not an alien Church, but is the ancient, historic Church of the principality, and has been described even by its enemies as "an ancient and venerable institution."

2.—The Church is not a Church introduced into Wales by the English nation, but was founded in Wales in the 6th century, and so recently as February 20th, 1891, Mr. Gladstone said in the House of Commons, "We might really speak with as much justice of the Church of Wales in England, as of the Church of England in Wales."

3.—By the Church in Wales is meant the four dioceses of Bangor, Llandaff, St. Asaph and St. David's, extending over the twelve counties of Principality, and the English county of Monmouth. These dioceses were founded and established in the *6th century, before the English people had become Christian. For* 1,300 *years there has been a practically unbroken succession of bishops.* The Church of to-day in Wales is one with the Church of the 6th century.

4.—The Church in England was founded after the Church in Wales; and the two Churches lived side by side for several centuries before union was effected. The taking of the Welsh Church into the larger Church of England was not a result of the annexation of Wales to England. Union was a gradual process. During thirty-five years in the first half of the 12th century, each Welsh diocese separately accepted the supremacy of Canterbury. This occurred 150 years before Wales was united to England. The Church in Wales is not, therefore, the Church of England introduced into Wales. The Church in Wales has become a part of the Church of England by voluntary union and partnership.

5.—Through the thirteen centuries past, the dioceses of Wales have been endowed by churchmen. During that period these dioceses have been divided into a thousand parishes, and in them from their foundation, the offices and ministrations of the Church have been continuously given. The parishes owe their churches and endowments, and also the presence and the services of the clergy within them to the benevolence and devotion of Churchmen, from the earliest times to the present year.

6.—*The State has done none of these things. The State has neither established nor endowed the Church in Wales.* Long before English rule in the principality, and in times when there was no Welsh unity, the Church founded and established herself. She has had a long life, and has passed through many changes.

MR. GLADSTONE ON THE CHURCH IN WALES.

In the year 1870, when the subject of the Church in Wales was before the House of Commons, Mr. Watkin Williams, afterwards one of the judges of the High Court of Justice, having moved a Resolution in favour of its Disestablishment, Mr. Gladstone, then, as now Prime Minister, opposed the motion, and said:—

"My honourable and learned friend states that the Church of Wales is a complete, separate Church; and here he comes to what I would call the difficult part of his case, because, except for the sake of truth and for conventional purposes, *there is really no Church in Wales.* The Welsh Sees are simply four Sees held by the suffragans of the Archbishop of Canterbury, and form a portion of that province as much as any four English Sees in that province. My honourable and learned friend says, and shows that there was a time when the Welsh Church was a separate Church. No doubt this is perfectly true; but at the same time it is necessary to go back nearly 1,300 years for the purpose of proving that distinct and separate existence, and 1,300 years form a period in which the waves of time effectually efface any footprints that may have been made on the sands. *As regards the identity of these Churches, the whole system of known law, usage and history has made them completely one, there is a complete ecclesiastical, constitutional, legal and, I may add, for every practical purpose historical identity between the Church in Wales and the rest of the Church of England. I think, therefore, it is practically impossible to separate the case of Wales from that of England.* That is not my assertion alone. It is evidently the belief of my honourable and learned friend himself. He has not said that we can disestablish the Church in Wales and leave the Church of England

established. Nay, more, he has gone very far indeed towards saying the reverse, because he said: *It may be said, 'If you disestablish it in Wales you may disestablish it also in Cornwall and Yorkshire,' and in answer to that I say as a Welshman, 'Let Cornwall and Yorkshire look after themselves.'* I will add that whenever those places wish to disestablish their Church they shall have my hearty support. *If there are those who consider that National Establishments are opposed, under all circumstances, to the principle of the Christian Religion, we do not belong to the number of such persons.*"—Speech in the House of Commons, May 24th, 1870.

The following statistics are irrefutable evidence as to progress made by the Church in Wales:—

PROGRESS DURING TEN YEARS ENDING JULY, 1894.

	Population.	Inhabited Houses.	Benifices.	Rural Deaneries.	Clergy. Resident.	Clergy. Assistant.	1882-1891. Ten years. Churches Built or Rebuilt.	1882-1891. Ten years. Churches Restor'd or Enlarged.
Bangor ...	226,040	49,727	143	14	140	80	12	24
Llandaff...	603,020	109,871	247	20	247	206	61	55
S. Asaph...	268,901	56,865	207	16	207	97	8	26
S. David's	482,245	99,113	414	31	369	117	28	76

No. of Clergy, 1891 ... 1458 Income average £180.

No. of Clergy, 1831 ... 700 Income average £221.

CHURCH BUILDING AND RESTORATION FROM 1840—1891.

	Lord Hampton's Return, 1840—1874.		Duke of Westminster's Return. 1874—1891.		Total.	Voluntary Offerings, 1891.
Bangor ...	£161,312	+	£143,527	=	£344,839	£5,767
Llandaff ...	£145,111	+	£335,350	=	£480,461	£40,727
S. Asaph ...	£408,371	+	£233,209	=	£641,580	£7,044
S. David's ...	£374,453	+	£415,390	=	£789,843	£31,976
					£2,216,723	

	Baptisms.	Baptisms—Adult.	Confirmations. 1882—1891.		1891.		Remarks.
			Centres.	Candidates.	Centres.	Candidates.	
Bangor..			203	9,070	45	1,466	
Llandaff.			439	34,873	59	4,456	
S. Asaph			296	20,394	15	857	
S.David's	1880. 4,854 1888. 4,655 1891. 5,017	1878-80 426 1890-92 754	460	27,451	62	2,827	Triennial Confirmations. 1876. 4,352 1882. 7,361 1891. 8,901 Communicants. 1877. 26,589 1892. 39,326

THE WELSH VOTE.

At the last General Election in July, 1892, 78,046 persons in Welsh counties and boroughs voted against Home Rule and disestablishment, and 129,724 voted in favour of those revolutionary measures. The former body are only represented in Parliament by three members, and the latter by 31 members.

Mr. Asquith, in introducing the Welsh Suspensory Bill, sneered at the small majorities by which the three Unionist members secured their seats, whereas in fact they represent the views of considerably more than one-third of the total voters of the Principality. In the face of the above facts, it is very surprising that the Welsh Radicals should persist in stating that four-fifths of the people of Wales are in favour of disestablishment. It is an assumption which is unsupported by any facts. The results of

the last election go very far to prove that the Nonconformists in Wales are very much less than two to one of the population.

	No. of electors voted for Welsh constituencies.	Conservatives.	Separatists.
Counties	136,543	50,997 ...	85,546
Boroughs	71,227	27,049 ...	44,178
	207,770	78,046	129,724

Thirty-four members for Wales and Monmouth returned—viz., 31 Liberals, 3 Conservatives; ought to be 12 Conservatives, 22 Liberals; nine extra Conservatives, equal to 18 on a division, reducing Gladstonian majority to 24 from 42.

Appendix XLIII.

PAYMENT OF MEMBERS.

1.—COST.

The House of Commons contains 670 members. If some of these were paid and some were not, an invidious distinction would be at once created. All or none of them would therefore have to be paid.

Now in the Republican United States of America each delegate to Congress is paid £1,000 (5,000 dollars) per annum, besides travelling expenses. In France each deputy is paid about £360 (9,000 francs) per annum, and a free pass to and from his constituency.

If the members of the British House of Commons are to be paid the same sum as American Congressmen, £500 a year, in that case no less than £335,000 *yearly will have to be raised by taxation* to meet the expense.

2.—IS IT WORTH THE COST?

It is said that every other Legislative Assembly in the world has paid members. But that is no argument whatever for adopting the system in England; for it is the proud boast of Englishmen that their Parliament, in which members serve, not for a livelihood, but from motives of patriotism and honourable ambition, is the best and purest in the world. Why, then, degrade it from this proud pre-eminence? In the United States politics have become a profession, and so notoriously venal and corrupt that respectable men hold aloof.

The Panama Scandals have thrown a lurid light on the state of things in the French Chamber. There a large number of Deputies and several Ministers have been convicted of using their political influence in order to obtain bribes from a Commercial Company. No less than three French ex-Premiers are gravely involved in the Panama Scandal. The corruption in the French Assembly and among French officials is deep and widespread. It is due to the fact that French Deputies are mostly professional politicians, that is, most greedy adventurers. The average English member is a man to whom money is of little consideration, and who is not exposed to the temptation to accept a bribe. Do we want a class of professional politicians in England? Read the opinion of that strong Radical, Mr. J. S. Mill, in his book on "Representative Government":—

3.—MR. J. S. MILL'S OPINION.

"No remuneration which any one would think of attaching to the post would attract it to those who were seriously engaged in other lucrative professions with a prospect of succeeding in them. *The business of a member of Parliament would therefore become an occupation in itself, carried on like other professions, with a view chiefly to its pecuniary returns and under the demoralising influences of an occupation essentially precarious.* It would become an object of desire to adventurers of a low class, and 658 persons in possession, with 10 or 20 times as many in expectancy, would be incessantly bidding to attract or retain the suffrages of the electors, by promising all things, honest or dishonest, possible or impossible, and rivalling each other in pandering to the meanest feelings and most ignorant prejudices of the vulgarest part of the crowd."

4.—MR. GLADSTONE'S OPINION.

On April 5th, 1870, the late Mr. P. A. Taylor asked for leave to introduce a Bill to carry out the principle of paid members. Mr. Gladstone said:—

"Is there anywhere, among all the legislative assemblies of all the countries of the world, which, as my hon. friend has reminded us, are in almost all instances in his favour, though I think we might have found some more in our Colonies against him; but admitting that the rule is with him, is it true that those legislative chambers are more distinguished either by laborious service or by conscientious service than this British House of Commons, which is admitted in all countries to stand at the head of the representative assemblies of the world? *What assembly is there that attempts and transacts such an amount of business? What assembly is there in which not only the official members*—who, as my hon. friend says, are paid, and I will go one step further and say, are amply and liberally paid—but also all the other members, without distinction of class, *undergo so much personal effort and personal inconvenience*, so much sacrifice of comfort and risk to health, really and truly arising out of the discharge of duty, as is done by the members of this House?"

On the question of cost, Mr. Gladstone said:—

"I am afraid my honourable friend himself threatens a considerably greater augmentation of the public charge than he allows.

"Be that as it may, I contend that *the public enjoys the fortunate advantage of having plenty of persons who are ready to serve it for nothing, and that the public is entitled to the benefit.* When there are numbers of well-qualified men ready to give their labour without being paid, why should we go out our of way and insist upon adding to the taxation of the country for the purpose of giving them a payment?"

The motion was lost by 213 votes to 24. In the majority against payment of members were 143 Liberals, including—

Brand, Hon. H. (Lord Hampden).
Brassey, Sir T. (Lord Brassey).
Bruce, H. A. (Lord Aberdare).
Childers, H. C. E.
Dillwyn, L. L.
Duff, R. W.
Gladstone, W. E.
Kay-Shuttleworth, Sir U.
Lefevre, G. Shaw.
McArthur, W.
McLagan, Peter.
Pease, Sir J. W.
Rathbone, W.
Richard, H.
Stansfield, James.
Stevenson, J. C.
Trevelyan, Sir G. O.

5.—ONE OF SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT'S OPINIONS.

"One of the strongest of all reasons which had induced the *working* men throughout the country not to elect men of their own class was that strong common sense and practical knowledge which distinguished them, and which taught them that *men in their own class were not the best fitted to carry out the business of representing them in that House.* They knew that a man who had to live by weekly wages could not sit morning and evening in that House, and at the same time earn his bread. He could come in only on one condition, and that was as a paid delegate. Once pay a member for his votes collectively and he will very soon make a market for his individual votes."—July 31st, 1871.

6.—A LESSON FROM AUSTRALIA.

"Sir Samuel Griffiths (Premier of Queensland) holds that there is reason to believe that there *has sprung up in many parts of Australia a class of persons to whom £300 a year is a much greater amount* than they could otherwise expect to earn by the exercise of any calling for which they were naturally fitted, but *who, with a faculty for talking glibly,* have seized the opportunity of getting into Parliament and making a much larger income."—*St. James's Gazette,* November 25th, 1892.

7.—WILL WORKING-MEN MEMBERS BE THEREBY INCREASED?

Experience teaches the contrary. When there is a working man of striking political ability and force of character he generally can make his way into the House of Commons without the taxpayers' money. But payment of members does not seem to increase his chance. Here is what Mr. Bryce, M.P. (a member of Mr. Gladstone's Cabinet, and the author of the standard work on America) says of the system of salaried legislators in the United States:—

"*It contributes to keep up a class of professional politicians;* for the salary, though

small compared with the incomes earned by successful merchants or lawyers, is a prize to men of the class whence professional politicians usually come. On the other hand, the benefit which the English advocates of paid legislature dilate on, viz. : *the introduction of a large number of representative working men, has hitherto been little desired and nowise secured.* Few such persons appear as candidates in America, and until recently the working class has not deemed itself, nor acted, as a special body with special interests."—*The American Commonwealth*, I., 259. And again :—

"In Victoria (Australia) members of the popular House receive a salary of £300 a year. I understand that this has had, so far, no considerable effect in enabling working men to enter the assembly."—*Id.*, p. 261.

The only effect of paying members of Parliament would be to increase the class of needy, self-advertising, loquacious members, who would take up politics as a profession, in order to make money out of politics. Such a class may benefit themselves, but they are fatal to their country.

Appendix XLIV.

THE LOCAL VETO BILL.

Of all the monstrous measures which the Government have introduced, that for establishing Local Option and the Direct Veto is the most absurd. The Bill is tyrannical and unjust. It enables two-thirds of the voters in any local area to decide that every public-house within that area shall be closed after three years, without any compensation.

DOWNRIGHT CONFISCATION.

The present owners of public-houses and the holders of licenses have given, in many cases, thousands of pounds for their property in the trade, which has been carried on for many years by the direct sanction of Parliament and under Acts of Parliament. Local Veto without compensation simply means wholesale confiscation. The three years' grace is practically worthless. It only extends to three years from the passing of the Act. In any district in which the veto is passed two years or more after the passing of the Act, only one year's grace will be allowed. Let us take the case of a public-house which has cost £5,000. If the Veto be passed in a parish where that public-house is situated, can any sane man suppose that the owner of the house, or the holder of a license would get £500 for his property, even in consideration of the three years' delay ?

NO PRECEDENT.

The Irish Land Act of 1881, which, in the end, reduced the incomes of Irish landowners by an average of some 20 per cent., though it was very unjust, still had a theory of principle at its

back. The reduction of the rents of the Irish landowners without compensation was nominally based on the fact that the value of agricultural produce had greatly fallen since the rents were fixed The present attack upon the licensed trades is a great step, and a very pernicious one beyond that, in the downward road of wholesale confiscation. It is not too much to say that, wherever local option is put into practice and the direct veto is carried out, at least 75 per cent of the capital value of the public-houses and their licenses will be utterly wiped out and destroyed, This is confiscation pure and simple. Nothing like it has ever before been proposed by any British Ministry.

If the direct veto were universally carried out throughout the country without compensation, property to the amount of over £100,000,000 would be destroyed ; and some 2,000,000 persons, who at present obtain their living through the licensed trades, would be thrown upon the rates.

LOSS OF REVENUE.

Besides this, the excise levied upon beer and spirits contributes over £25,000,000 to the national revenue. If the licensed trade be destroyed, the greater part of this revenue would be lost. From what interest or what class is this lost revenue to be raised?

ONE LAW FOR THE RICH, ANOTHER FOR THE POOR.

This measure is most unjust to the working man. It would deprive him of the power to get his beer fresh and good when he wants it. The wealthier classes can keep their cellars well stocked with wine and beer at all times ready for use. The poor man and his family and lodgers are absolutely dependent for their refreshment upon the public-house.

The more devoted to drink a locality may be, the less likely would it be to secure the majority necessary for the local veto under this Bill. Therefore the more sober localities, which need the Bill the least, would suffer under its provisions. One effect of the measure would be that in a wealthy neighbourhood where the rich inhabitants would be supplied with refreshment out of their own cellars and clubs, they could vote to close all public-houses in their district. The result would be that workmen, cabmen and others employed in the district would be deprived of their necessary refreshment.

METHODS UNWORKABLE.

Moreover, the area chosen for the exercise of the vote upon Local Option is ridiculously small, and must lead to the utmost inequalities and complications. In the counties that area is to be

the parish; in small boroughs, the borough; and in larger boroughs, the wards. In London it is to be the area of the sanitary authority or parish. How utterly absurd will be the results produced! In the counties, one parish, numbering say 1,000 inhabitants, would perhaps have 200 voters under Sir William Harcourt's Bill. One-tenth, that is, twenty voters, will be able to demand a poll. Perhaps 150 electors will record their votes. Let us assume that 101 vote for the direct veto, and 49 against it. The veto would then be carried by a majority of two-thirds; for two-thirds of those who vote, and not two-thirds of the total electorate, are all that are required to carry the local veto. The result will be that 101 electors will be able, out of a population of 1,000 people, to shut up every public house in the parish, and impose their will upon the 899 other inhabitants:

GROSS INEQUALITIES.

But that is not all. Some, at least, of the neighbouring parishes, are certain to reject the veto. Their public-houses will, in consequence, remain open. All the inhabitants of those parishes where the direct veto has been carried into effect will simply walk across the boundary into the parishes where the veto has been negatived, and drink as as much as they please. Publicans and brewers in the parishes where the veto has been adopted will be ruined Those in the parishes where the veto has been refused will drive a double trade, and make their fortunes with great rapidity. Or, take the case of London. Let us suppose that Marylebone and Kensington adopt the direct veto, and that Paddington and Chelsea reject it. Can anything exceed the preposterous absurdity of the results that will follow? Every inhabitant of Marylebone and Kensington who wishes to obtain drink will simply walk into Paddington or Chelsea and get as much as he wants. Publicans in Marylebone and Kensington will be ruined; those in Paddington and Chelsea will have an increased and splendid trade.

Sunday closing may be set up by much the same process within the same local areas, with the exception that a bare majority of those voting is sufficient to carry it, and that it will come into operation immediately.

ENDLESS DISCORD.

A measure of this kind is bound to lead to wholesale inequality and corruption. The injustice, the inconsistency, and the utter absurdity of such a system as this cannot be exaggerated. Is it to be supposed that the licensing trades will submit without a struggle to have their property ruined?

A fresh poll can be taken every three years, and it is certain,

that the greatest possible efforts will be made by the licensed trades to reverse the veto, which means absolute ruin to them.

The law may be as stringent as possible, but when a man's whole fortune depends upon the popular vote, it is quite certain that no regulations will deter that man from trying to save his property even at great personal risk. The battle would be fought out with tremendous tenacity in every parish, and in every borough and ward in England. It would divide the population into two hostile camps throughout the land. Parish would be set against parish, and the teetotalers and anti-teetotalers within every parish would be at deadly feud. A more mischievous, unjust, and disturbing measure has never been introduced into Parliament.

"CADGING" FOR VOTES.

The Local Veto Bill has been introduced to satisfy the fanatical temperance supporters of the Government. It is part of the general system of "cadging" for votes amongst all the crotcheteers and fanatics of the electorate, which is the only policy of Mr. Gladstone's present Government.

The unity of the kingdom and the integrity of the empire are to be sacrificed to the votes of the Irish rebels. The Church in Wales is to be destroyed, and a grave blow aimed at the Church in England, in order to get the votes of the Welsh disestablishers. The same bribe is being offered to those opposed to the Church Establishment in Scotland. The independence of Members of Parliament, and the superior character of British legislators are to be undermined in order to satisfy Gladstonian carpet-bag adventurers who desire to be paid Members of Parliament. The influence of the more educated classes, the more industrious and the more stable of our working men, is to be overthrown, in order that the "shifters" and the idle may, by a ridiculously short term of residence, obtain the franchise and swamp their superior fellow-workmen.

All these schemes have one aim, and one only—to sweep into the Gladstonian net every possible class of voter, and to create fresh masses of electors in order that Mr. Gladstone's Government may by their inexperience and prejudices be kept in office.

ELECTORAL STATISTICS.—NUMBER OF VOTES POLLED, 1874–1892.

The following return gives approximately the number of votes polled in contested constituencies at the last five General Elections. Its value for purposes of comparison is of course very much neutralised by the large number of uncontested Elections, especially in 1886.

	1874.		1880.		1885.			1886.				1892.				
	Cons. Vote. — C.	Lib. Vote. — L.	Cons. Vote. — C.	Lib. Vote. — L.	Cons. Vote. — C.	Lib. Vote. — L.	Nationalist Vote. — N.	Cons. Vote. — C.	Lib. Unionist Vote. — LU.	Gladstonian Liberal Vote. — GL.	Nationalist Vote. — N.	Con. and LU. Vote. — U.	Gladstonian Liberal Vote. — GL.	Labour and Indpt. Vote. — Lab.	Nationalist Vote. — N.	Parnellite Vote. — PN.
England	556,966	567,025	738,420	873,282	1,599,718	1,736,935	2,824	884,600	231,292	997,849	2,911	1,703,053	1,563,402	54,494	2,537	—
Wales	27,465	38,444	25,034	41,837	67,293	105,444	—	24,791	23,809	60,183	—	63,924	109,455	—	—	—
Scotland	50,872	84,666	62,936	127,023	156,589	283,879	—	53,295	106,077	183,325	—	207,636	248,757	5,446	—	—
Ireland	55,429	66,251	55,176	46,108	111,616	30,694	296,960	75,093	24,808	—	96,863	82,124	—	—	239,756	69,194
Total	690,732	756,386	881,566	1,088,250	1,935,216	2,156,952	299,784	1,037,779	385,986	1,241,357	99,774	2,056,737	1,921,614	59,940	242,293	69,194

STATE OF PARTIES.

1st AUGUST, 1892.†

	Conservatives.	Liberal Unionists.	Gladstonian Liberals & Labour.	Nationalists.	Parnellite Nationalists.
England—					
Counties	114	17	102	—	—
Boroughs	117	14	93	1	—
Wales—					
Counties	—	—	19	—	—
Boroughs	2	—	9	—	—
Scotland—					
Counties	7	5	26	—	—
Burghs	2	6	23	—	—
Ireland—					
Counties	13	2	—	63	5
Boroughs	4	2	—	6	4
Universities	8	1	—	—	—
Total.....	267	47	272	70	9

† Five Vacancies—N.E. Cork, Walsall E. Aberdeenshire, Hexham Div. of Northumberland, and S. Meath.

PARTY GAINS AND LOSSES.—1886—1892.

State of Parties	Cons.	Lib. Unionist.	Gl. Lib. and Labour.	Nationalist.
After General Election of 1886...	316	78	191	85
Before do. do. 1892...	304	66	214	86
After 12th August, 1892	267	47	272	9 Parnellites 70 Anti-Parnellites
	314			351
March 22nd, 1893	267	47	275	(5 vacancies) 9 Parnellites 72 Anti-Parnellites
	314			356

IRISH COUNTIES.

Name of Constituency.	Population.	Registered Electors.	Poll.			Majority.
			Conservative or Unionist.	Anti-Parnellite.	Parnellite.	
Antrim, North	51,056	9,035	4,666	2,027	—	2,539
,, South	50,875	10 479	Unopp.	—	—	—
,, Mid	50,197	8,081	,,	—	—	—
,, East	51,772	8,724	,,	—	—	—
Armagh, North	48,455	10,153	,,	—	—	—
,, Mid	45,873	7,470	,,	—	—	—
,, South	43,143	7,523	2,242	3,439	59	1,197
Carlow	40,899	6,874	813	3,738	—	2,925
Cavan, East...	53,920	9,606	1,360	6,024	—	4,664
,, West	57,750	10,856	1,967	6,475	—	4,508
Clare, West	62,518	11.077	—	2,871	3,878	1,001
,, East	61,341	11,198	—	2,868	3,314	446
Cork County, North ...	48,917	9,008	—	Unopp.	—	—
,, North-East ...	49,837	8,781	—	,,	—	—
,, Mid	49,594	9,965	—	,,	—	—
,, East... ...	49,284	6,993	—	,,	—	—
,, West ...	50,186	5,854	329	3,155	—	2,826
,, South ...	46,269	8,738	—	Unopp.	—	—
,, South-East ...	45,663	10,602	692	4,109	—	3,418
Donegal, East	45,459	7,051	2,783	3,546	—	763
,, North	46,379	6,965	—	3,819	1,108	2,711
,, South	46.442	6,710	1,400	3,930	—	2,530
,, West	46,931	5,279	—	Unopp.	—	—
Down, East	52,270	8,757	Unopp.	—	—	—
,, North	54,114	9,306	,,	—	—	—
,, South	51,771	9,342	3,636	4,207	42	571
,, West	50,731	10.368	Unopp.	—	—	—
Dublin County, North ...	75,097	11,400	1,648	2,727	4,037	2,389
,, South ...	75,118	10.388	4,371	1,452	2,261	2,110
,, (University) ...	—	4,352	2,188	—	—	1,291
,, ,, ...	—	—	1,609	—	—	712
			897			
Fermanagh, North	37,756	5,937	2,879	2,562	—	317
,, South	36,281	5,788	2,320	2,941	—	621
Galway, Connemara ...	50,362	6,815	—	2,637	598	2,039
,, East	48,939	8,034	—	4,456	974	3,482
,, North	51,902	8,328	—	1,651	2,040	399
,, South	46,111	6,708	—	2,623	1,411	1,212
Kerry, East	44,048	5,885	253	2,600	—	2,347
,, North	43,559	5,855	—	2,828	776	1,052
,, South	45,498	3,686	86	2,096	225	1,871
,, West...	45,814	6,336	42	2,461	1,135	1,326
Kildare, North	32.191	5,901	—	2,153	1,707	1,446
,, South	37,797	5,973	—	2,642	975	1,667

Name of Constituency.	Population.	Registered Electors.	Poll.			Majority.
			Conservative or Unionist.	Anti-Parnellite.	Parnellite.	
Kilkenny, North	35,804	5,879	314	2,898	—	584
,, South	38,027	6,385	253	3,346	—	3,093
King's County, Birr ...	33,846	5,253	670	3,329	—	2,659
,, Tullamore...	31,562	5,295	—	Unopp.	—	—
Leitrim, North	40,585	6,692	645	4,510	—	3,865
,, South	37,794	6,253	516	4,271	—	3,755
Limerick County, East ...	56,763	7,118	—	3,257	858	2,399
,, ,, West ...	55,891	8,144	—	2,903	1,174	1,729
Londonderry County, North	59,788	11,443	5,490	2,300	—	3,190
,, ,, South	58,985	9,308	4,554	4,053	—	501
Longford, North	26,902	4,589	203	2,741	—	2,538
,, South	25,651	4,614	347	2,544	—	2,197
Louth, North	35,536	5,534	—	2,268	*1,569	699
,, South	33,316	5,418	—	2,451	1,126	1,335
Mayo, East	52,639	6,387	—	2,621	257	2,364
,, North	52,830	6,860	—	2,311	1,472	839
,, South	56,398	9,723	—	Unopp.	—	—
,, West...	56,539	10.644	—	3,456	*609	2,847
Meath, North	39,394	5,990	—	2,549	2,146	403
,, South	37,222	6,538	—	2,212	2,129	93
Monaghan, North	43,479	7,047	2,230	3,697	—	1,467
,, South	42,610	7,120	1,007	4,243	—	3,136
Queen's County, Ossory ...	32,503	7,007	523	3,666	—	3,143
,, ,, Leix ...	32,136	6,288	513	3,261	—	2,748
Roscommon, North ...	56,394	9,730	—	3,250	3,198	52
,, South ...	57,800	9,417	—	2,244	3,815	1,571
Sligo, North	48,458	8,992	958	4,216	—	3,256
,, South...	49,880	8,055	548	5,490	—	4,842
Tipperary, East	44,751	6,180	—	2,998	891	2,107
,, Mid	45,208	7,596	346	3,284	887	2,397
,, North	43,009	7,029	462	4,064	—	3,602
,, South	39,914	5,964	—	2,571	773	1,798
Tyrone, East	44,730	7,188	3,222	3,430	—	108
,, Mid	43,221	7,678	2,698	3,667	123	979
,, North	42,412	6,481	3,045	2,996	—	49
,, South	40,915	7,070	3,468	3,096	—	372
Waterford County, East ...	33,072	6,411	—	2,552	1,042	1,510
,, ,, West ...	37,435	6,667	—	Unopp.	—	—
Westmeath, North	33,715	5,347	—	2,878	379	2,499
,, South	31,313	5,304	—	2,523	1,076	1,447
Wexford, North	55,465	9,890	859	5,732	—	4,873
,, South	56,071	9,872	354	5,104	—	4,750
Wicklow, West	30,710	4,853	784	2,582	546	1,798
,, East	31,224	4,583	1,225	1,433	1,115	208

* Independent.

IRISH BOROUGHS.

Name of Constituency.	Population.	Registered Electors.	Poll.			Majority.
			Conservative or Unionist.	Anti-Parnellite.	Parnellite.	
Belfast, East	85,484	11,339	Unopp.	—	—	—
,, South	58,529	7,563	,,	—	—	—
,, West	61,548	8,334	4,316	3,427	—	839
,, North	67,494	8,610	Unopp.	—	—	—
Cork, City	96,891	10,276	—	5,273	3,186	2,087
				4,759	3,077	1,682
Dublin City, College Green	70,972	6,781	1,441	1,116	2,568	1,127
,, Harbour ...	69,723	11,370	—	1,376	4,482	3,106
,, St. Stephen's Gn.	73,167	8,284	2,893	615	2,878	1,997
,, St. Patrick's ...	65,034	7,261	—	1,096	3,693	15
Galway	16,942	1,909	—	644	593	51
Kilkenny	13,323	1,803	—	744	604	140
Limerick, City	45,909	5,084	—	1,878	1,490	388
Londonderry	32,893	3,161	1,986	1,960	—	26
Newry	13,605	1,847	744	907	54	853
Waterford	27,623	3,974	—	1,248	1,638	390

The Ulster Counties are Antrim, Armagh, Cavan, Donegal, Down, Fermanagh, Londonderry, Monaghan, and Tyrone, with a total population of 1,617,877. The total poll at the General Election of 1893 was 237,993, of which 126,884 was Unionist, and 111,109 Nationalist.

APPENDIX XLVI.

REVOLT OF THE IRISH LOYALISTS.

The Loyalists of Ireland are acting in a way which must convince the most blind partisan of "Home Rule" that they are intensely earnest and determined in their resolve not to submit to a separate Irish Parliament. The Irish Loyalists number over a million and a half of the Irish people. They are satisfied with the Union. They trust in the impartiality and justice of the Imperial Parliament. They ask for no change. They feel that the liberty they enjoy, both civil and religious, and the security they possess for person and property under the Union Jack, would be hopelessly lost under a Parliament controlled by men like Mr. T. Healy, Mr. William O'Brien, Mr. Sexton, and Mr. John Dillon, and under the supreme dictation of an ambitious and unscrupulous Prelate like Archbishop Walsh.

Every section and every creed of Loyalists have already pronounced the most emphatic and unequivocal protests against Mr. Gladstone's Bill. Episcopalians and Wesleyans, Presbyterians and Congregationalists, are all unanimous and united in their denunciation of a separate Parliament and of its consequences. The Roman Catholic Loyalists have spoken with as much fervour against the Bill.

The gravest news comes from Ulster. The whole Protestant population is arming and ready to take the field with rifles in hand, rather than submit to a separate Parliament at Dublin. Mr. Gladstone refuses to listen to, or even to read, the accounts of the indignant resistance of Irish loyalists. The crisis is the gravest that has faced the country for many years.

ALL ULSTER ENROLLED.

The most striking and practical evidence of the fixed resolution of the Loyalists of Ulster never to accept "Home Rule" is shown in the organisation which is now being formed by the Ulster Defence Union. A Manifesto was issued on March 17th, St. Patrick's Day, to the Loyal People of Ulster, and signed by the Duke of Abercorn, the Marquis of Londonderry, the Earl of Erne, Lord Arthur Hill, Colonel Saunderson, the Lord Mayor of Belfast, the Mayor of Derry, Messrs. T. Andrews, A. Duffin, and T. Sinclair, and dated from Belfast. It says:—

"Fellow-countrymen,—A crisis has arisen, the gravity of which cannot be over-estimated. Our liberties, our fortunes, and the future of our country are in danger. We must be prepared for every eventuality. . . . . An organisation is called for, invested by your direct authority, not to continue merely the struggle for the Legislative Union, but to be *ready in your name to meet any contingency that may arise.* The knowledge that your interests are being watched over, and your policy directed by an organisation composed of men, chosen by yourselves, on whose loyality and sagacity you can rely, will serve to allay undue excitement and to check any disorderly outbreak of popular feeling. . . . The first and most important step towards forming a representative organisation is that all Unionists should enrol as members of the 'Ulster Defence Union.' The only qualification required is that they be full grown men, and the only pledge one of fidelity to the Legislative Union as it exists. *Each polling district will select delegates from enrolled Unionists to represent it on a Central Assembly. This assembly shall consist of 600 delegates*, who, in their turn, will select a Council of 40, exclusive of the Ulster Unionist representatives in both Houses of Parliament, who will be *ex-officio* members. This Council will have power to regulate its own procedure and from time to time to summon the Central Assembly as occasion may require. Steps will be taken at an early date to establish the necessary electoral system. Meanwhile be patient, enrol, combine."

The remainder of the manifesto is addressed "To our fellow Loyalists in the other provinces of Ireland," and describes the plan of organisation of the Ulster Defence Union as above.

By this organisation every able-bodied Loyalist in Ulster will be enrolled and organised, ready to demonstrate, and, if need be, to fight.

Ulster will have a completely representative Parliament of its own, ready to defend the Union to the death.

ULSTER ARMING.

The temper of the Ulster Loyalists is well described by the special correspondent of the *Daily Telegraph*, on March 13th. He gave a picture of the situation in Ireland which must be most disquieting to Mr. Gladstone and his friends. With regard to the attitude of Ulster, on which the Radicals have been heaping ridicule, the correspondent says:—

"It need not be a matter for astonishment in England if, before the end of the year, *Ulster alone is able to place 100,000 armed men in the field.* Of course, she could not maintain them more than six weeks; but that would be long enough to do almost irreparable mischief to Ireland and the United Kingdom. Believe me in this matter I am no alarmist, neither am I a novice in such issues. The indications are all too serious to be ignored or shuffled into the background. I am sure mere words will not persuade these Irish Protestants to lay down their arms, and the fat would indeed be in the fire were the task left to an Irish Parliamentary force. 'There are the constabulary and the soldiers.' Yes, but my duty is to warn the public that to-day the constabulary are discontented and Mr. Morley will never be able to exact from them again that splendid discipline which they formerly displayed at Belfast. The news I have to impart is that nearly half that magnificent body are 'out of humour' at the turn of events. 'But there are the troops to fall back on; the rank-and-file of the six battalions here, many of whom I have conversed with, will not, of course, adopt French tactics and fraternise with the people. Still, 'what can we do,' they have said to me, 'if we are sent to fire on people singing "God Save the Queen"?' Englishmen must reckon up these contingencies as soon as they can. I am sure that if the measure is carried they must be faced. 'It is as certain as to-morrow's sun will rise that if ever Gladstone's Home Rule Bill were to pass into law, the tocsin would sound in Ulster, Munster, and Leinster to stand to arms.' These are the actual words a distinguished public man and an old acquaintance made use of to-day in replying to my question as to whether the Irish Unionists would not quietly accept the inevitable, should the measure for the future Government of Ireland be carried in Parliament. The same opinion of the situation has been conveyed to me, though differently worded, by working men, employers of labour, professional men, and eminent officials.

"Every day the Unionist press has columns of notices of meetings, all breathing the same spirit, throughout the length and breadth of the four provinces. In such apparently lost districts to 'Unionism' *as Cork and Waterford, the cry of 'united people, united Parliament' has gathered such force that large assemblages have met and recorded their protest against the Bill.* On Tuesday in Waterford there was an enthusiastic meeting, when the measure was condemned and money liberally voted to perfect organised opposition. Since the opening of subscriptions in Dublin, now a little over two weeks ago, a sum of £12,000 has, I learn, been subscribed in the Irish capital. There is no reason to doubt the prognostications of the local opponents of Home Rule when they declare that ere long *they will have a chest*, to be used for the dissemination of information, *of not less than £50,000.* Compared with what Ireland has subscribed towards the Home Rule agitation, the amount and spontaneity of the fund sent in to defeat the Gladstonian measure are startling and significant.

"I attended a 'No Home Rule' meeting in Newry on Monday night, and had excellent opportunities afforded me of judging of the tone and temper of that part of Ulster. I stayed long enough in the town to learn that *the majority of the men are*

organised into clubs or lodges, and that they have already possessed themselves o *no inconsiderable number of Snider rifles.* Not only in Newry is this the case, but in the surrounding district. One small place not 100 miles off has, I was assured, a store of over 200 rifles."

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC LOYALISTS.

A very large gathering of Roman Catholics was held in Dublin on March 10th, to protest against the Bill. In the south and west of Ireland, especially in Cork, Limerick and Waterford, many Roman Catholics have joined with the Protestants in condemning the measure.

The following address has been issued by a large number of leading Irish Catholics "To our fellow Roman Catholics in Ireland":—

"As a false impression has been created that the contest upon the Home Rule Bill is, in reality, a contest between only a Roman Catholic majority and a Protestant minority, we have thought it right, in order to make our position clear, that Irish Roman Catholic Unionists should have an opportunity of joining in a *separate and distinct petition to Parliament against the Bill.* While deprecating certain anti-Catholic utterances to which the excitement of the occasion may have given rise, we are, so far as our objections to Home Rule rest upon purely secular considerations, heartily in accord with our fellow-Unionists. More than this, we believe that Home Rule, if imposed upon Ireland would, under the peculiar conditions of the country, foster a revolutionary spirit disastrous to the true interests of our religion. We therefore invite our fellow Roman Catholics in Ireland to join us in signing the petition, a copy of which is appended to this letter."

The signatures to the foregoing are about fifty in number, and include those of Lords Fingall, Kenmare, Louth, Emly, De Freyne, and Westmeath, Count de la Poer, Sir H. Grattan Bellew, Captain Ross of Bladensburg, Mr. Daniel O'Connell (a nephew of "the Liberator"), Dr. Cruise, Sir Stephen de Vere, Colonel Dease (ex-Governor of the Bank of Ireland), Sir Percy Grace, Mr. Kenny, Q.C., M.P., Sir Richard Martin (chairman of the Dublin Chamber of Commerce), Sir Maurice O'Connell, and Mr. Piers F. White, Q.C.

Over 12,000 persons of all classes and creeds have signed petitions against the Bill in the City of Cork.

THE CHURCH OF IRELAND.

The Church of Ireland, numbering 630,000 members, has sent a protest signed by the Archbishop of Armagh (Primate), by the Archbishop of Dublin, seven Bishops, and some 15,000 select vestrymen, the popularly elected representatives of the whole body of lay members of the Irish Church. There were only about 30 dissentients in the whole Church of Ireland.

The venerable and eloquent Bishop Alexander also made a

remarkable speech against the Bill, of which the following is an extract:—

"It is not the voices of the Episcopalians or the Orangemen, or the squires, or of Ulster; it is not the voices of Protestantism alone; it is the exceeding great and bitter cry of civilized humanity. (Cheers.) It is the voice of the English settlers, it is the voice of the Scotch settlers who were deluded into coming over to Ireland. It is the voice of earnest Roman Catholics. It is not a 'No Popery' cry. (Hear, hear.) If it were a 'No Popery' cry I for one would not stand upon this platform. (Cheers.) There are many earnest and noble-minded Roman Catholics to whom I could trust anything (cheers); there are many of them whom I love. (Hear, hear.) They have prayed for me and I have prayed for them, and one word disrespectul of them I never will utter. (Cheers.) But I tell you what it is. It is the voice of 630,000 Churchmen, with some 20 or 30 exceptions; it is the voice of about 550,000 Presbyterians and other forms of Protestantism (cheers), and amongst them are multitudes of men who, I know, were Mr. Gladstone's warmest adherants up to the last general election. (Hear, hear.) It is the voice of trade, it is the voice of commerce, it is the voice of capital, it is the voice of their great seat of learning—it is the voice of all that think and work. (Cheers.) People in England talk about the fanatics of Belfast; but are the men of Ulster fanatics? ('No, no.') I have spoken to these men, and I will tell the reason why they hate the Bill. They know the value of trade, they know the character of the men who employ so many looms, and who have launched upon the sea vessels like the *Majestic* and the *Teutonic*. (Cheers.) They know what the meaning of capital is—that it does not only mean the storage of money, but that it means intellect (hear, hear), and they know that, as surely as the glass falls before the storm, so surely capital will leave Ulster, and misery will come to them and theirs—that they will not have employment, and will be forced to go elsewhere to seek for it. (Hear, hear.) They know that the shrinkage of capital is the starvation of labour. (Cheers.) I am astonished lately by one discovery. I know that there are in the Liberal party many political land-grabbers who would cure a sick country by bloodletting and superabundant doses of hot water; but I did not know that there are humanitarians who would not shed one drop of blood for the honour of the Empire, but who are willing to flood all Ulster with blood: and if they goad on the spirits of young and fiery youths, and drive them to excesses, and the troops of the Queen are compelled to fire on them, any drop of blood that is shed will be upon the head of England (hear, hear), and all the water of all the seas upon which her navies ride will never wash away the stain. (Cheers.) As for those who sneer at the anger of Ulster they are very witty indeed in laughing at her piety, but a common danger makes men pray in common.' (Hear, hear.) I should have thought that this descendant of the Puritan was the last man who would have laughed at psalm singing. Our fathers once in England showed what these psalm-singing men could do. I believe that such Nonconformist as Dr. Clifford, who are against us, are led astray by applying the analogies of English political parties to polititical parties in this country. (Hear, hear.) Amongst Celtic politicians there is no disposition to give and take, and to secure a decent Conservative minority would, under any circumstances, be a hard thing; but the Bill intensifies the difficulty and swells it out into impossibility. (Hear, hear.) It amounts to gerrymandering. It drew mendacious maps. The political victim is strapped down tightly by both his arms and both his legs, and then put on the table, and a pitch plaster clapped over his mouth.

"I would say to my Nonconformist friends, if I could address them, 'Mr Gladstone comes before you with the biggest bribe in his right hand that ever was offered to the sons of men.' But then they may say, 'Ireland blocks the way, and until we have settled matters we cannot expect the disendowment.' It is a terrible price to pay—the agony of your kith and kin and ruin to the Empire. If the Bill comes into force every man in his senses acquainted with Ireland knows that the voluntary churches in that country will be wiped out. (Hear, hear.) Mr. Gladstone

would cut down the Upas tree of an old ascendancy, and now plant a new ascendancy. (Hear, hear.) Can inconsistency go beyond this? (Cheers.) I would say to all thinking men in the United Kingdom, and especially to the Nonconformists, 'Help us, help us, as the friends of liberty in the past, and as the friends of purity of election.' I would put it on another footing. I have none of the airy asceticism of the late convert to temperance, Sir William Harcourt. (Laughter.) But as friends of temperance I call on them to help us in the work. (Hear, hear.) The Bill staggers under whisky in its financial proposals. (Hear, hear.) It stinks of whisky, and the snake bite of the national bankruptcy has to be doctored by doses of national drunkenness. (Cheers.) Terrible and dark will be the shadow of their shame if the great betrayal should be accomplished. The great betrayal would be followed by a great fall, the fall of an Empire, and the isles would shake with the sound of it. (Cheers.)

The Archbishop of Armagh, Primate of the Irish Church, said in his speech on March 14th :—

"It would be far better to call it a Bill to suppress the Protestant Faith (hear, hear) ; a Bill to subjugate this country to Papal dictation ; and he ventured to say that no one in that vast assembly would be able to fathom the dangers which it contained. In the first place, *it would check all progress in Ireland—social, moral and commercial*—for very many years ; secondly, it would suppress the right of civil and religious liberty, rendering it intolerable for their poor Protestant-scattered congregations in the South and West to exist there ; thirdly, it would violate the rights of property, whether private or public, or even corporate ; and he thought the storm would break first over the head of their honoured University. (Hear, hear.) It would set up in three provinces of Ireland Roman Catholic ascendancy, and he ventured to think that enlightened Roman Catholics would object to that quite as much as Protestants would. (Hear, hear.) Besides all this, the Bill itself was bristling with dangers to the Empire at large, of Ireland in particular, and to their own dear Church. Surely, then, it was the duty of that great assembly, representing the voice of the Church of Ireland, to enter their solemn protest against it. (Hear, hear.) It was the duty of every loyal man to use every legitimate means to prevent it passing into law."

THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

The Irish Presbyterians, who number 550,000, have protested with not less unanimity.

A meeting of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church took place in Belfast on March 15th, "to consider the dangers by which our civil and religious liberties are menaced by proposed legislation, and to determine what action should be taken thereon." The attendance was exceedingly large, clerical and lay members being present from the most remote parts of the country. The Moderator, the Rev. R. M. Edgar, presided. The Rev. Dr. Petticrew proposed the following resolutions, which were carried :—

"(1) That we declare anew our devoted loyalty to the person and Throne of Her gracious Majesty Queen Victoria.

"(2) That we re-affirm our strong attachment to the Constitution of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and express our determination to resist every attempt to destroy the legislative union at present existing, and our firm resolve to maintain unimpaired for ourselves and our children the heritage of citizenship which we now enjoy. We protest against any proposal to thrust us

out from the protection of the Imperial Legislature in violation of repeated assurances that the liberties and interests of the Protestant minority were safe in the hands of the Parliament of the United Kingdom.

"(3) That, having carefullye xamined the measure at present before Parliament, entitled, "A Bill to amend the Provisions for the better Government of Ireland," we are amazed at its revolutionary character, and streuously oppose its enactment by the Legislature for the following among other reasons :—(*a*) Because the measure seriously imperils our civil and religious liberties, inasmuch as it would deprive us of the protection of the Imperial Parliament and Government under which our persons and property are safe, and our religious freedom is secure, and *would force upon us instead an Irish Legislature and Executive controlled by men declared to be 'marching through rapine to the dismemberment of the Empire,'* whom a Special Commission found to be 'guilty of a criminal conspiracy,' and who have supported, and still attempt to justify, the iniquitous and criminal organization of the Land League, the Plan of Campaign, and the system of boycotting. (*b*) Because the provisions which the Bill contains for the protection of minorities against misgovernment and sectarian domination are illusory in themselves, and would be incapable of application in the face of a hostile majority. In the opinion of the Assembly no securities can be devised which would safeguard the rights and privileges of minorities under an Irish Legislature as they are safeguarded under the Imperial Parliament. (*c*) Because the Bill proposes momentous changes in the Constitution of the United Kingdom, to which changes the Protestants of all the Churches, and many Roman Catholics, comprising over a third of the population of Ireland and representing the intelligence, education, wealth, and industry of the country, are determinedly hostile.

"(4) That the Assembly is strongly of opinion that the land question has long laid at the root of Irish discontent, and that the time has come for the abolition of dual ownership, which only the Imperial Parliament can with justice effect.

"(5) That the General Assembly earnestly exhorts the members of the Presbyterian Church to continue to cultivate forbearance, peace, and goodwill toward their fellow-countrymen, of every class and creed, and to exhibit calmness and patient reliance upon the Most High in the present eventful crisis.

"(6) That the Assembly recommends that in all churches Sabbath, the 26th day of March, be observed as a day of humiliation and prayer, when we shall confess our sins and *entreat the Most High to avert the dangers with which the Church and the country are at present threatened, and to extend His kingdom throughout the land.*

"(7) That copies of these resolutions, signed in the name of the Assembly by the Moderator and the clerk, be transmitted to Her Majesty the Queen, the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, the Prime Minister, the Chief Secretary, the Marquis of Salisbury, the Duke of Devonshire, Mr. A. J. Balfour, M.P., and Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, M.P.

"(8) That a petition embodying the resolutions, and similarly signed, be presented to both Houses of Parliament, and that the committee on the state of the country be empowered to send deputations to wait upon the Prime Minister and on other members of the Legislature, and to send speakers to address public meetings in Great Britain."

The resolutions were put and carried unanimously. A scene of the greatest excitement followed the declaration of the Moderator to this effect. The members began running up and down the aisles of the church shouting against Home Rule, and then the whole of the assembly sang the National Anthem with much fervour, an incident very unusual in a Presbyterian church.

THE METHODIST CHURCH.

The Irish Methodists have shewn themselves not less determined against a separate Parliament.

"The Committee of Privileges of the Methodist Church in Ireland, representing the conference in the interval of its sessions, recently met in the Centenary Church, St. Stephen's Green, and passed a series of resolutions condemning the Home Rule Bill, and setting forth, among other things, that the Bill, if it became law, would be a fruitful occasion of distressing discord and strife; that the *religious equality now happily subsisting would speedily be destroyed, and religious freedom be seriously imperilled;* that class would be arrayed against class, and party against party, with a virulence now rare or unknown; and that the inevitable result would be, not the amending of the provision for the government of Ireland, but *the overturning of all order and good government.* The committee urged that *the Bill should be opposed at every stage of its progress*, and recommended the ministers, office-bearers, and members of the Methodist Church in Ireland to give expression to that opposition either by petition from individual congregations, or by signing local petitions, or taking part, where it might be deemed expedient, in local meetings to protest against the Bill. They further requested the vice-president of the conference to recommend that in every congregation special prayer should be offered."

THE QUAKERS' PROTEST.

The following manifesto has been issued by the members of the Society of Friends, a body of very considerable wealth and influence in the North of Ireland:—

"At the present crisis it is of real importance that the sentiments and feelings of the Irish population should be accurately understood, and this can only result from the views of moderate men having consideration as well as those men holding extreme opinions. As members of the Society of Friends, we are not prepared to withstand by armed resistance a change of government, however obnoxious, and therefore we cannot join any movement which may result in force.

"Looking at the present situation with an intimate knowledge of the public sentiments, we desire to place the following considerations before our fellow-members in England. Our population is divided practically into three parties. The largest consists of Roman Catholics, embracing, it may be said, the whole of the priesthood. Next in number are the Protestants of all denominations with very few exceptions; and, lastly, the independent Roman Catholics, who disapprove of the domination of their clergy in politics. Two separate conventions have recently been held in Dublin of delegates from all parts representing the first and third named parties. These conventions accepted the Government of Ireland Bill, but only as a step towards the realization of their separate aims. This was plainly stated at these conventions. The second party intensely dislikes the Bill, and a large proportion are prepared to join in resistance. This from every indication we unhesitatingly believe, however lamentable the fact may be. We would, therefore, put it to our friends whether it is wise to force on legislation, which, as a final or satifactory measure, is not accepted by any party in Ireland."

THE WOMEN REJECT IT.

Even the women are everywhere joining in the general protest. A remarkable demonstration against the Home Rule Bill took

place in Londonderry on March 8th, when, in response to a public notice issued by Mrs. Beresford and Mrs. Tillie, *nearly* 3,000 *women, of all classes and from all parts of the north-west, assembled in the Guildhall,* under the presidency of the Mayoress of Londonderry, Mrs. M'Cullagh. The original intention had been to hold the meeting in the Council Chamber, but not even the large new Assembly Hall served to accommodate more than three-fourths of those seeking to gain admission; while so great was the enthusiasm that hundreds of factory and laundry workers, who had intended to stay only for the dinner hour, remained to the close, and lost their half-day's wages. The speeches were delivered entirely by ladies, and were marked by great freshness and originality of argument. The first resolution pledged the meeting to determined hostility to the Bill. Other meetings of a similar character have been held.

RUINOUS TO TRADE.

The voice of commerce and of trade is unanimous against this monstrous measure. On March 10th, a most influential deputation of 80 gentlemen, representing the wealth and industry of Dublin and Southern Ireland, had an interview, at 20, Arlington Street, with Lord Salisbury, Mr. A. Balfour, Lord Randolph Churchill, and Mr. Goschen. Mr. Gladstone had previously refused to see them. Lord Iveagh introduced the members of the deputation, which was composed of bankers, railway directors, leading merchants, and heads of industrial enterprises.

Mr. J. R. Wigham, hon. secretary of the Dublin Chamber of Commerce, said he had been asked to read the address which they had brought with them for presentation. The deputation was composed solely of commercial men from the three southern provinces of Ireland, and comprised men of almost all grades. *There were Catholics and Protestants, Liberals and Conservatives, and there were also bankers, merchants, and traders in every business.* The address described the whole scope of the Bill as radically unjust and certain to promote neither peace nor progress in Ireland, and adds:—"The Bill throws amongst us a new apple of discord, and plunges Ireland again into a state of political and party ferment, which cannot but arrest business enterprise in every direction. We find in the Bill no prospect of anything but the perpetuation and intensification of the unsettlement, which has so long been a source of shame and sorrow to all true friends of Ireland; and we earnestly trust, not only for the sake of Ireland, but for the sake also of the United Kingdom, of which Ireland still forms an integral part, and of the Empire, in which Irishmen, attached subjects of our gracious Queen, and loyal adherents of the Constitution, have been proud to have their birthright, that it may never be allowed to pass into law."

Lord Salisbury made a most sympathic reply, in the course of which he severely condemned Mr. Gladstone's refusal to receive the deputation. He said:—"I am indeed very much surprised that the Prime Minister should have declined to listen to this deputation. I am surprised that he did not earnestly welcome you, as being

able to offer him facts by which he might have been guided in the most perilous and difficult task that any Minister in any age of this country has ever undertaken. (Hear, hear.) I cannot help putting his action in that respect by the side of his evident desire to push the Bill through its second reading in the House of Commons with unseemly and precipitate haste; and that his action in both respects is to be found in what was said by one of you gentlemen—that this Bill was only slowly becoming thoroughly understood by the English people. (Hear, hear.) The Bill deals with matters not familiar—it is complicated and abstruse, and it is only gradually and with great effort, and by the lapse of a sufficient time, that the real character of its provisions, the real nature of the tremendous steps they are invited to take, will be brought home to their intelligence; therefore, those who desire to push this Bill desire that it should have the least possible notice, the least publicity, and that the task shall be fulfilled within the briefest space of time that shall give the smallest opportunity for explanation and discussion. Death without talking is the sentence he desires to pass upon the material interests of Ireland. I would venture to point out to you, to learn in the acts of our adversaries what is the course it is imperatively necessary to follow. The more he dislikes explanation and publicity, the more we must cultivate and press it; the more he withdraws the Bill from the English people, the more you must be heard, and make them understand it; and you must take every opportunity, not merely in general statement, but in detail, to appreciate the terrible injury which this Bill will inevitably inflict upon the reviving industry and prosperity of your native country."

INJURY TO ENGLISH TRADE.

The following are but a few out of hundreds of evidences that have come to light of the paralysing and disastrous effect that the Separatist Policy of Mr. Gladstone has already exercised upon Irish and English trade. The first circular has been sent by a firm of Belfast hardware merchants to all English manufacturers with whom they have business relations:—

"RE HOME RULE BILL.

"Dear Sir,—The feeling of alarm in reference to above Bill amongst business men here is so intense that, until this ill-conceived measure is abandoned or destroyed, we must expect very bad trade throughout Ireland.

"In consequence of this unprecedented state of things, we feel ourselves compelled for the present to reduce our stock, and have instructed the buyers in our various departments to order only such goods as we have received orders for.

"We beg you will in the meantime cancel any orders for stock goods which you may have in hand.

"We much regret being obliged to adopt this course of action towards our English and Scotch friends, with whom we have had such steady and pleasant business transactions for the past thirty years, and sincerely trust the dark cloud at present overshadowing our country may soon pass away, and that our usual business relations may be resumed."

The following letter has been received by a wholesale firm in London from a general draper trading in a town in the county of Roscommon, Ireland:—

"Gentlemen,—In November last I was persuaded to give your representative, Mr.——, a small order for prints and French goods, which was to come in March 20th. Owing to a combination of circumstances over which I have had no control, I find it wiser not to have any goods from you at present. This Home

Rule Bill which Mr. Gladstone is forcing on us has palalysed trade. The people who have a little money won't spend it until the question is decided. I am, therefore, obliged to ask you to cancel this order, and you will much oblige, yours faithfully, "——.

"P.S.—If this measure becomes law in Ireland, Manchester and London manufacturers and merchants will have very little stake in this country."

THE TRADE OF BELFAST.

The protest of the Chamber of Commerce of Belfast, which appeared in the *Times* of Saturday, March 18th, is one of the most remarkable of all those that have yet been published. It gives facts connected with the general condition of Ireland, and the relative prosperity of Ulster which cannot be ignored.

On March 17th, the voice of commercial Ulster was heard with regard to the proposals of the Home Rule Bill. The Belfast Chamber of Commerce met in its full strength to consider the provisions of the measure, Mr. John Greenhill, the president, occupying the chair. The council of the Chamber, which had been instructed "to consider the relations of the Irish Government Bill to the financial, manufacturing, and commercial interests of Ulster," submitted a report which contained the following:—

IRELAND *v.* ENGLAND.

"The resources of Ireland are unequal to supporting a national government. A few figures will make clear what we mean. The total valuation of the country is a trifle over £14,000,000 sterling; while the valuation of Great Britain exceeds £200,000,000. The income-tax of Ireland is £556,000; in Great Britain it amounts to £13,296,000. Compare, again, the main evidences of commercial and trading wealth. The coal raised in Great Britain in 1891 was valued at £74,099,816, that raised in Ireland the same year is given at £44,542. On the railways in Great Britain 306,000,000 tons were carried in 1891; in Ireland 4,410,731, and of this amount the railways terminating in Belfast carried 41 per cent.

"The total railway receipts of Ireland (of which 30 per cent. is taken by the above-mentioned lines) amount to about 4 per cent. of the railway receipts of Great Britain. The capital of all the railways of Ireland is under £40,000,000—about £10,000,000 less than that of the Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway alone. The registered tonnage of the ports of Great Britain is 7,990,261; that of all the ports of Ireland is 256,439, and of this Belfast holds 55 per cent. It is no exaggeration to say that more than one English county is at least as well fitted, economically and socially, for self-government as the kingdom of Ireland. Again, the commercial and manufacturing districts (which we claim to represent) form but a fraction of the whole.

"The greater part of the rest of Ireland has neither the resources, the capital, nor the unity of race or interest to render it capable of standing alone without the support of Imperial credit. It is manifestly unfitted for a tremendous experiment, and nothing seems to promise that such an experiment would succeed."

PROSPERITY DEPENDS UPON THE UNION.

"The first condition for successful trade is security. *In Belfast, under the shelter of the Union*, protected by British commercial laws, with the advantage of British fiscal legislation in which we share, *there has grown up the first really great*

evelopment of trade and industry ever known in the history of Ireland. From Belfast, as a centre, business has spread and is spreading. Londonderry, Coleraine, Ballymena, Lisburn, Lurgan, Banbridge, Gilford, Portadown, Cookstown, Strabane, Dungannon, and many other towns are closely connected with Belfast by commercial ties, and there are now millions of money employed in it, and tens of thousands of persons dependent on it, and thriving by it. *The development of that trade is entirely dependent on the maintenance of the sense of security*; and it is useless to shut our eyes to the fact that the mere introduction of the Bill which we have been deputed to examine has seriously shaken credit.

"We take two instances of the practical effect of this Bill, financially—one general and one local. For years this Chamber (in connexion with other Chambers of Commerce) has been earnestly advocating extensions of public facilities, both in the direction of postal reforms and of telegraphic advantages. We have addressed ourselves hitherto to a great Imperial Department, with a surplus of three millions at command; *while under this Bill we would have to deal with a provincial department, worked at an estimated annual loss of £50,000.* We have examined the Excise clauses and find that, *if the consumption of spirits be reduced by 1,000,000 gallons, the entire surplus revenue is gone;* and it cannot be recovered by raising the rate of duty, for under the Bill any additional amount gained by the increase of that rate is payable to the English Exchequer.

"It is impossible to disregard the vindictive folly which has already threatened the linen trade of Ulster, and which led to the New Tipperary fiasco, with all the misery and waste consequent on it; or to forget the imbecile termination of the Irish Land Purchase and Settlement Company; the misapplication of funds supplied to relieve distress; and the repeated attempts made, through the agency of the Poor Law and Labourers' Tenements Acts, to inflict injury on political opponents. We have asked in vain for any definite statement of social or material improvement to Ireland likely to result from this Bill. *The only methods towards such ends suggested by the Nationalists point to protection and bounties;* and we note that, while the Bill would seem to exclude protective duties, there is nothing to exclude bounties. It is therefore manifest that the majority are to be at liberty to apply taxes raised in Belfast and Ulster to create and foster opposition trades in other places. No one can read the Bill, even cursorily, without seeing that in several ways taxation can be applied to crush political opponents."

PROGRESS OF BELFAST.

"*All our progress has been made under the Union.* We were a small, insignificant town at the end of the last century, deeply disaffected and hostile to the British Empire: since the Union, and under equal laws, we have been welded to the Empire, and have made a progress second to none. In 1783 we find the population of Belfast was 13,105; in 1891 it was 255,950. In 1861 the valuation of the city was £270,930; in 1893, £741,000. In 1837 the funds at command of the three banks having head offices in Belfast was £1,488,134; in 1892 the amount was £14,797,285—that is to say, the total funds at disposal of these banks exceed in amount now, by four millions sterling, the total at the disposal of the four largest joint stock banks in London in 1844, at the passing of the Bank Charter Act. In 1837 the tonnage of vessels clearing from Belfast was 288,143; in 1892 it was 2,053,637 tons, and the harbour receipts are 39 per cent. of the total harbour receipts of all Ireland. *The foreign imports are* £9,106,000, 36 *per cent. of the sum total imported into Ireland. The Customs duties paid in Belfast are* 44 *per cent.* of the whole collected n the island. The Customs amount to £2,376,511; inland revenue between £900,000 and £1,000,000 more, making together over £3,250,000, being a contribution to the Imperial revenue surpassed by no ports in the United Kingdom except London and Liverpool; it is nearly a million more than the Prime Minister's estimate of Ireland's share of the Imperial expenditure. This progress has been made under precisely the same laws as those which govern the other cities and

provinces of Ireland. The circumstances of Ireland—the peculiarities of its population, its poverty and absence of natural resources—render the experiment of autonomy exceptionally dangerous, and we anticipate from such an experiment absolute disaster; that the Bill as drawn is radically and incurably unjust; and that, should it become law, the result would be a blow as deadly to Irish commercial interests as were the measures framed centuries ago intentionally to ruin Irish trade."

The president moved the adoption of the report, and Mr. D. B. Lytle, ex-president, seconded the motion. Mr. Thomas Sinclair, in supporting it, said the meeting represented at least £80,000,000 of capital in their protest against Home Rule. The report of the council was adopted with one dissentient, and a deputation was appointed to present the views of the Chamber to the Prime Minister, or, if he declined to receive them, to the other Government leaders, and to Lord Salisbury and to other members of the Opposition.

At a recent meeting of the Belfast Corporation, it was stated that by the Home Rule Bill the loss in connection with municipal matters would be £76,000, independently of £15,000 in connection with the Poor Law. To meet this an increased taxation of 2s. 6d. in the pound would be necessary.

PROTEST OF THE STOCK EXCHANGE.

One of the most significant protests which have yet been made against the Home Rule Bill is a petition to Parliament from the members of the Dublin Stock Exchange. No more competent or trustworthy witnesses could be found to give testimony on such a subject. The petition sets forth that the Bill would, if passed into law, be "disastrous to the trade and commerce of this country; credit will be destroyed, and all enterprise paralyzed." It continues:—

"The pursuance of their ordinary avocation places your petitioners in a position to form a just and reasonable opinion as to the effect of the measure upon the very large amount of capital—almost entirely Irish capital—embarked in the various commercial, industrial, and financial undertakings in Ireland. Your petitioners can testify that immediately previous to the introduction of this measure these undertakings generally had reached a degree of credit and prosperity never before suspected; but the publication of the conditions and full text of the aforesaid Bill created an intense feeling of alarm amongst holders of all classes of securities in Ireland, resulting in a depreciation in their market value to the extent of several millions sterling. This unrest has since, to some extent, been temporarily allayed by the opinion gaining ground that the measure may not become law. Your petitioners include men of various religious and political opinions, who could not possibly have joined so universally in this petition had not their experience so seriously impressed them with the dangers to be apprehended from the passing of a Bill so framed as that now under consideration. The petitioners therefore pray your honourable House not to pass the said Bill, which, they believe, while causing disaster to the merchant, the manufacturer, and the capitalist, will bring distress on all classes of society through the length and breadth of this island."

The Dublin Stock Exchange is composed of 66 members, of whom 63 have signed, one is absent, and two refused to sign. Ten of the signatories are Roman Catholics.

DUBLIN UNIVERSITY WILL NOT HAVE IT.

A meeting of graduates of Dublin University, to protest against the Home Rule Bill, was held on March 10th, in the Examination Hall, Trinity College. Professor Dowden occupied the chair. The Rev. Dr Shaw moved:—

"That the graduates of the University of Dublin desire to express their emphatic protest against the injustice of the clauses in the Government of Ireland Bill, 1893, by which the University of Dublin is left open to spoliation, and, at the same time, deprived of its representation in Parliament."

Professor Mahaffy seconded the resolution, and it was passed unanimously. It was further resolved, on the motion of the Rev. Canon Carmichael, seconded by Professor Cunningham:—

"That the graduates of the University of Dublin desire to place on record their strong condemnation of the Government of Ireland Bill, 1893, as being certain, if passed into law, to prove disastrous to Ireland, injurious to Great Britain, and most dangerous to the interests of the Empire."

THE IRISH PHYSICIANS CONDEMN IT.

The following resolution has been passed by the College of Physicians at a full meeting specially convened and presided over by Dr. Finney:—

"That the college protest in the strongest manner against the Bill introduced into the House of Commons, entitled: 'A Bill for the Better Government of Ireland,' believing that, were it to become law, the dismemberment of this country would be effected, the safeguards of civil and religious liberty would be imperilled, the means of livelihood of the members and licentiates of this college would be seriously curtailed, and the privileges which this college has enjoyed, similar to those of the Royal Colleges of London and Edinburgh, under Her Gracious Majesty and her Royal predecessors, would be greatly impaired."

The resolution was strongly supported by Dr. James Little, Dr. Cruise, and Dr. Quinlan, the Catholic Fellows of the college. On a division it was adopted with only four dissentients.

ALARM IN THE CIVIL SERVICE.

The Home Rule Bill has caused a great panic amongst the Civil servants, who find that practically no security is provided for them either as to the retention of their offices or the giving of compensation, or retiring pension, while, as the Irish Executive will have to provide the money, it is expected there will be a strong motion for reducing the allowance to the smallest possible sum.

THE ORANGEMEN UNANIMOUS AGAINST IT.

The Orangemen at home and abroad are moving as one man against the Bill, and with tremendous earnestness.

A crowded meeting, convened by the Orange lodges of the city and county of Dublin, and of Trinity College, Dublin, was

held on March 11th in the Leinster Hall. The hall, which holds 4,000 persons, was filled half an hour before the proceedings began, and the utmost enthusiasm was shown throughout. The Earl of Erne, Grand Master of the Orangemen of Ireland, was voted to the chair. The secretary stated that a number of letters expressing sympathy with the objects of the meeting had been received, including one, which he read, from the Rev. Dr. Kane, Grand Master of the Orangemen of Belfast.

The chairman then addressed the meeting. He denounced the conduct of Mr. Gladstone and his Government in keeping the country in absolute darkness about the Bill, and then in three weeks after its introduction attempting to rush it through the House of Commons. It had been represented to the British electorate that, if the Bill passed, Parliament would be rid of Irish affairs and could devote its attention to other needful legislation, and that work would be found for Irishmen at home, who would no longer flood the labour market of England. He maintained, however, that the result would be diametrically the opposite. They would have a majority in power one week by its British supporters, and the next week turned out of office by the Irish members, who could render legislation almost impossible. As to the effect upon the labour market, *so far from Irish labour being employed at home, if the Bill of* 1886 *had passed, many large firms had made arrangements to transfer their capital and plant across the water* at an enormous sacrifice, thus throwing out of employment hundreds and thousands of people in Ireland, who would be obliged to leave the country. *The classes thrown out of employment would go to England, overstock the labour market, and pull down wages already too low.*

Resolutions were then passed unanimously condemning the Bill, expressing the opinion that it would be disastrous in its effects to Ireland, and pledging the meeting to frustrate the measure by every legitimate means.

SOLEMN PROTEST AT BELFAST.

"A great mass meeting of Belfast Orangemen, to protest against the Home Rule Bill, was held on March 2nd, in the Ulster Hall, under the presidency of the Grand Master, the Rev. Dr. Kane. It was in several respects a remarkable gathering, and one incident was very impressive, and may prove to possess a certain historic interest.

"The demonstration was organised by the Grand Lodge of Belfast, which represents nine separate districts, each containing about twenty lodges. Led by bands and banners, the 'brethren,' who assembled in the various Orange halls throughout the city, marched to the Ulster Hall, but this building only held about

seven thousand, and the rest, twice that number, were unable to gain admittance.

"*Mr. William Johnston, M.P*, produced a sensation towards the close of his speech, by *producing a Bible, placing his left hand upon it, raising his right hand to Heaven, and calling upon the audience to rise and repeat*:—'We take this solemn oath on the Bible, and we pledge ourselves before High Heaven, that, come weal or come woe, we will stand by the Legislative Union, should we have to fight over again the Battle of the Boyne.' *The audience, during the repetition of the words, rose to their feet and held up their hands, the sight being most impressive;* and, remaining standing, the great meeting sang 'Rule Britannia' and 'God save the Queen.'

"The resolutions were adopted amid a scene of great enthusiasm, the entire audience rising again and singing the National Anthem and 'Rule Britannia.'

"The Chairman then said: 'In the name of the manhood of Ulster, in the name of freedom, of mankind, by the memory of the heroism of our ancestors, and under the sense of the obligations of posterity, in your name, *I tear up this infamous Home Rule Bill.*' This announcement was followed by prolonged cheers and Kentish fire, during which the chairman tore up a copy of the Bill."—*Daily Press*, March 3rd.

CANADIAN ORANGEMEN.

The *Boston Journal* of February 28th publishes the following telegram from Montreal:—Twenty thousand Canadian Orangemen are actively engaged in secret preparations for rendering assistance to the population of Ulster in the event of the passing of the Home Rule Bill. Money is being freely subscribed.

Appendix XLVII.

CANADIAN HISTORY AND HOME RULE.

The following most important letter, showing how false is the Home Rule argument from the analogy of our Colonies, appeared in the *Times* of August 19th, 1892, from Professor Goldwin Smith (Toronto):—

"Sir,—Once more an attempt is being made to lure Great Britain over the precipice of dismemberment by false lights cast from Canadian history. This time it is the Canadian, Mr. Edward Blake, who, it seems, has been assuring the British public that the effect of Home Rule conferred on Canada was the immediate transformation of a malcontent and rebellious into a contented and loyal colony. His inference is that the same happy change will be wrought by Home Rule in Ireland.

"Mr. Blake fails, as all who have dealt with the subject on his side have failed, to distinguish between Home Rule and independence. If they observed that distinction they might see that the lesson of Canadian history is the opposite of that which they assume. In 1791 Pitt gave each of the two Canadas a measure of Home Rule similar in its fundamental character to that which it is now proposed to give to Ireland. He gave each of them a Parliament of its own, but reserved to the Imperial Government and the Governor of the colony, as its representative, a supreme power of control. The consequence in both cases, instead of being contentment and loyalty, was the commencement of a desperate and protracted struggle to get rid of the Imperial power of control and turn Home Rule into practical independence. This struggle, after lasting for half a century, culminated in a double rebellion, which was followed by a surrender under decorous forms and phrases on the part of the Imperial Government.

"That which was conferred upon the colonies after the rebellion, in 1841, was not Home Rule, but independence, legislative, administrative and fiscal, though under the forms and titles of a dependency. Of course, when the Imperial power of control had been resigned, the resistance to it was at an end and tranquility ensued.

"The independence conferred in 1841 was legislative, administrative and fiscal, the Imperial veto in those departments being reduced in all ordinary cases to a name. It was not diplomatic, judicial or military, as the Foreign Office retained its control and the Privy Council its supreme jurisdiction, while a British general continued to command the Canadian militia. But twenty years ago Mr. Edward Blake put himself at the head of a young Liberal party, the ultimate aim of which was understood to be independence pure and simple, in opposition to the Liberals of the old school, who clung to British connection. Mr. Blake proclaimed that under existing limitations five millions of Britons were not free. By the institution of a Canadian Supreme Court he made a great advance towards judicial independence, and his whole policy as a Minister pointed in the same direction.

"Diplomatic independence Canada has practically asserted in the commercial sphere. Her fiscal independence she has used to the extent of laying heavy protective duties on the goods of the mother country. There have been symptoms in some quarters of a disposition to get rid even of the British commander of the militia.

"The course of events in the other North American colonies was the same that it was in the two Canadas. Home Rule—that is, a Colonial Parliament under Imperial control—was granted to each of them, and the grant was the signal for a struggle on the part of the colony in each case to get rid of the Imperial control and improve Home Rule into independence.

"The real moral of Canadian history, then, and of the history of the North American colonies generally, is that, by conceding Home Rule, instead of satisfying, you stimulate aspirations and set on foot a struggle for independence which, if the dependency can find an ally in British faction, is sure to end in a complete surrender on the part of the Imperial country.

"In the strange history of this Irish question nothing will hereafter seem more strange than the historical analogies which have been adduced and apparently accepted in favour of Home Rule for Ireland. It will seem scarcely credible that eminent men and leading publicists should have cited the legislative emancipation of Iceland—a thinly-peopled island a thousand miles off—by Denmark as a proof that the United Kingdom might safely and with advantage allow an independent and hostile nation to be carved out of its side. For hostile from the very circumstances of its formation an independent Ireland would be."

THE NATIONALISTS IN 1885.

APPENDIX—XLVIII.

It is amusing to read the ferocious terms of the Nationalist Manifesto, issued to the electors of Great Britain in November, 1885, in the light of the exaggerated compliments that have since passed, and of the warm friendship that now exists, between the Nationalist party and Mr. Gladstone. The Nationalist views have not changed, though Sir William Harcourt and his friends have gone through an astonishing conversion.

Mr. Parnell's manifesto of November 23rd, 1885, was sufficiently outspoken :—

"The Liberal party bound itself by most solemn pledges, and these it most flagrantly violated. It denounced coercion, and *it practised a system of coercion more brutal than that of any previous Administration, Liberal or Tory.* Under this system juries were packed with a shamelessness unprecedented even in Liberal Administrations, and innocent men were hung or sent to the living death of penal servitude; 1,200 *men were imprisoned without trial, ladies were convicted under an obsolete Act directed against the degraded of their sex*, and, for a period, every utterance of the popular Press and of the popular authority was as completely suppressed as if Ireland was Poland, and the Administration of England a Russian autocracy. The last declaration of Mr. Gladstone was that he intended to renew the very worst clauses of the Coercion Act of 1882; and if our long-delayed triumph had not turned the Liberal Government from office Lord Spencer would at this hour be in Dublin Castle, coercion would be triumphant in Ireland, and the landlords, instead of making the reasonable abatements demanded by the depression of agriculture, and conceded by every landlord in England and Scotland, would be evicting wholesale, with the encouragement of Lord Spencer, and the backing of police, soldiery, coercion magistrate, and filled gaols.

"Under such circumstances, *we feel bound to advise our countrymen to place no confidence in the Liberal or Radical party*, and so far as in them lies to prevent the Government of the Empire falling into the hands of a party so perfidious, treacherous, and incompetent. We earnestly advise our countrymen to *vote against the men who coerced Ireland, deluged Egypt with blood, menaced religious liberty in the school, freedom of speech in Parliament*, and promise to the country generally a repetition of the crimes and follies of the last Liberal Administration."

In October, 1881, Mr. Parnell, speaking of Mr. Gladstone's speech at Leeds, described the Prime Minister as "the greatest coercionist, the most unrivalled slanderer of the Irish nation that ever undertook the task." Mr. Parnell went on to say of Mr. Gladstone that—

"No misrepresentation is too low or too mean for him to stoop to, and it is a good sign that this masquerading knight errant, this pretended champion of the liberties of every nation, except those of the Irish nation, is obliged to throw off the mask."

A REMARKABLE CHANGE.

During the General Election, 1885, the Radical speakers denounced the Irish Parnellite party, and the latter retaliated with quite equal acerbity. Mr. T. P. O'Connor, who now cannot be too fulsome in his overstrained adulation of Mr. Gladstone, spoke thus at Manchester, in November, 1885:—

"If I were addressing a Radical audience, I would ask them if they were going to vote for the party that swore they would never give Ireland coercion, *and then coerced Ireland as Tory party never did*: I would ask them if they were going to put in the party which raised the taxation of the country, after preaching economy, to the highest point to which it had ever yet been. I would say in God's name put out the traitors to Radical principles, and see if they cannot do better with the Tory democracy. (Loud cheers.) I would ask them if they were going to vote for the party which had the blood of Gordon on its head, and which had been guilty of the tomfoolery of putting down three yards of railway and then pulling it up again; for the men who said one day of the week they would go to Khartoum, and the next day of the week changed their minds, as if they were talking about an excursion to Belle Vue. (Laughter and cheers.) During last week I have been busy, replying to a number of appeals from Radical candidates to be spared from the manifesto—(loud laughter)—but my reply in every case was 'No Radical need apply.' (Loud cheers)."

Since then the Parnellites and Nationalists have become Mr. Gladstone's most intimate friends and supporters, and the whole Gladstonian policy has been based upon the Nationalist demands.

The Nationalist Party have used very different language since that; they have hoped to extort from Mr. Gladstone's weakness the basis for separation. It is worth while for the followers of Mr Gladstone to consider how far they can trust the moderation or the promises of men whose opinions so rapidly shift and can be so fundamentally reversed.

The forces of disorder which had been temporarily held in check by the Nationalist leaders, pending the fate of Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule Bill, were let loose on the rejection of that measure in 1886, and the consequent return of a Conservative Government to power. Mr. Balfour's firm administration, however, gradually reduced them to powerlessness. At the present moment those same forces of disorder are being held in check for political effect and with much difficulty. They are ready to burst forth in outrage and murder the instant the Nationalist leaders again give the signal. Under a separate Irish Parliament controlled by the leaders of the National League, the village ruffian and outrage-monger, the boycotter and moonlighter would be supreme throughout the South and West of Ireland. The lives and the property of Loyalists would be absolutely unprotected. Their position would be full of peril and intolerable.

INDEX.

——:o:——

A

A Record of Unbroken Failure ... ... 132—156
A Remarkable Change 417
Agricultural Administration (Appendix XXXIII) 368
Agricultural Legislation (Appendix XXXII) 365
American View of the Irish Question 157
Analysis of Mr. Gladstone's 1893 Scheme ... ... 15—62
Appeal to Nonconformists (Appendix XL) 381
Appeal by Irish Nonconformists (Appendix XLI) 383
Army Administration (Appendix XXVIII) 353

B

Bad Precedents to be Shunned ... ... 76—83
Austria and Hungary 76
Croatia 78
Turkey 79
Sweden and Norway 79
Self-Governing Colonies 81
Former Irish Assemblies 82
Balfour's, Mr., Crimes' Act of 1887 ... ... 126—136
Plan of Campaign launched 1886 126
Mr. John Redmond, M.P. 126
Necessity for the Crimes' Act of 1887 127
Failure of the Ordinary Law 127
Mr. Campbell Bannerman's Testimony 128
Criminal Law and Precedure Acts, 1887 129
Mr. Gladstone intended the same Plan 130
The Crimes' Act of 1882 130
Proclamation of the National League 131
Small Amount of Coercion 132
Appeals 132
1,000 Persons Imprisoned without Trial by Mr. Gladstone 132
Diminution of number of Agrarian Outrages 133

Decrease of Boycotting 133
Reduction of Police Force 134
Mr. Justice O'Brien at Cork, 1892—Collapse of the Conspiracy ... 135
BALFOUR, Mr., ON LONDON QUESTIONS (Appendix XVII) 336
BETRAYAL OF LOYAL IRISHMEN 107
BREACH IN THE NATIONALIST PARTY 68
Blackmail to Law-breakers 319
BRITISH STATESMEN ON HOME RULE ... ... 189—201
Mr. Gladstone 189
Sir William Harcourt 192
Mr. John Bright 192
Earl Spencer 193
Sir George Trevelyan 193
Mr. James Bryce 195
Lord Rosebery 196
Mr. Canning 197
Sir Robert Peel 197
Earl Grey 197
Lord Brougham 198
Sir James Graham 198
Duke of Wellington 198
Lord Palmerston 198
Lord Macaulay 198
Earl Russell 198
Duke of Devonshire 199
Mr. Disraeli 199
Professor Goldwin Smith 199
Mr. Forster 200
Mr. Lecky 200
Mr. J. S. Mill 201
Mr. Matthew Arnold 201
BUDGET SUMMARY (Appendix XXIV) 348

C

CANALS AND RAILWAYS (Appendix XXXVI.) 374
CANADIAN HISTORY AND HOME RULE (Appendix XLVII.) 399
Causes of Mr. Gladstone's Defeat (1886) 155
CHURCH IN WALES, DEFENCE OF (Appendix XLII.) 384
COMPLICATIONS WITH THE UNITED STATES 102
Concession and Surrender (Mr. Gladstone's) 153
Constitution of the 1886 Parliament 150

Conservative Agricultural Administration (Appendix XXXIII.) 368
Conservative Naval Administration (Appendix XXIX.) 356
Conservative Mines Legislation (Appendix XXXIV.) 370
Conservative Protection of Sailors (Appendix XXXVII.) ... 375
Constructive Conservative Reforms (Appendix XXXVIII.) ... 376
Conservative Programme (Appendix XVI) 334
Constitution of Irish Majority and Minority (Appendix IV) ... 280
Contempt for Economic Laws 140
Crippling the Imperial Parliament 23

D

Decline of Ireland Under a Separation Parliament, 1782 to 1800 ... ... 170—172
The Paltriest Irish Movement 170
Ireland under the National League 171
Mr. Arnold Forster 172
Dedication 2
Deeds not Words (Appendix X) 319
Defence of the Church in Wales (Appendix XLII) 384
Development of Ireland under the Unionist Government 181—189
Savings Banks 182
Railway Receipts 184
Decrease of Population 184
Decrease in the rate of Emigration from 1886 to 1890 184
Housing of the People 185
Pauperism decreasing 186
Increase of Live Stock 187
Textile Industries 188
Post Office Department 189
Spirits and Beer 189
Danger from Irish Autonomy 21
Dillon's, Mr., Record (Appendix XIX) 342

E

Egypt under Gladstone and Salisbury (Appendix XIV) 326
Electoral Statistics (Appendix XLV) 395
England and English Vote ... ... 5—10
"Equitable Repartition of Finance" 25
Evictions—All about Them (Appendix VI) 288

F

FACTORIES AND WORKSHOPS (Appendix XXXV) 371
FIVE PRINCIPAL OBJECTIONS TO SEPARATE PARLIAMENT FOR IRELAND ... ... 84—123
1.—REPEAL OF THE UNION 88
2.—NO FINALITY 89
Separation or Civil War 90
The danger from an Independent Ireland 91
No practical check on Irish Legislature 93
The Link of the Crown 95
Real Objects of the Nationalist Party 96
3.—INJUSTICE TO THE BRITISH TAXPAYER 97
Collection of Taxes 97
Ireland's Quota 99
4.—COMPLICATIONS WITH THE UNITED STATES 102
The Irish in America 103
The Danger in Ireland 106
General International Complications 106
5 —BETRAYAL OF LOYAL IRISHMEN 107
Despair of Loyal Irishmen 111
The Misrepresentation of Ireland 113
General Loss to Ireland... 115
The Whole more important than a Part 118
Mr. Gladstone's Epithet "Foreign" 119
Appeal from Ulster 121
The Work of the Leagues 122
FOREIGN AFFAIRS UNDER LORD SALISBURY (Appendix XXX) 359
FREE EDUCATION (Appendix XII) 323

G

MR. GLADSTONE ON THE ENGLISH ... ... 10—14
MR. GLADSTONE'S 1893 SCHEME ANALYSED ... ... 15—62
Union is strength 15
Principal Features of the Bill 16
Mr. Gladstone's Five Principles 18
No Cause for the Bill 18
I. IMPERIAL UNITY DESTROYED... 20
Danger from Irish Autonomy 21
Test of Imperial Unity 22
Strategical Value of Ireland 23
Crippling the Imperial Parliament 23

Repeal of the Union 23
The Union was necessary 24
II. Equality between the Kingdoms 24
III. "Equitable Repartition of Finance" 25
Total Imperial Charges 28
The Two Budgets 29
Probable Irish Bankruptcy 30
IV. The Protection of Minorities 32
No Security for Persons 33
Impossibility of Redress 35
V. A Real and Continuous Settlement 36
Obstruction in Parliament 38
The Veto 39
No English Veto 40
Anti-Parnellites on the Imperial Veto 42
Gladstonian Leaders on Imperial Control 43
80 Irish Members in the Imperial Parliament 45
Irish Vote 46
Two Majorities 47
"To Vote or Not to Vote" 49
A Grave Constitutional Change 51
The Royal Irish Constabulary 52
The Irish Judges 53
Three Sets of Constituencies 54
Irish Land 54
Trade Bounties 55
Religious Establishment... 56
Bill fatal to Local Self Government 58
Injustice to Post Office and Savings Bank Investors 59
Appeal to the Judicial Committee 60
Trinity College 60
Scheme Utterly Impracticable 61
Mr. Gladstone's Broken Promises, and Lord Salisbury's Performances (Appendix XI.) 322
Mr. Gladstone's Conversion ... ... 62—68
Mr. Gladstone's Record of Unbroken Failure ... ... 132—156
Mr. Gladstone's Hopes from the Land Bills of 1870 and 1881 143
Mr. Gladstone's New Theory 147
Mr. Gladstone's History 148
Mr. Gladstone's Course in 1886 152
Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule Bills of 1893 and 1886 Compared 232—270
Legislative Authority 232

Exceptions from Power of Irish Legislature 232
Restrictions on Powers of Irish Legislature 233
Executive Authority 235
Constitution of Legislature 235
Retention of Irish Members 237
Finance ... ... 239—247
Irish Church Fund ... ... 244 & 245
Exchequer Division and Revenue Actions 247
Post Office, Postal Telegraphs and Savings Banks 249
Decision of Constitutional Questions 250
Lord Lieutenants and Crown Lands 252
Judges and Civil Servants 252
Police 255
Miscellaneous Audit 256
Privileges and Immunities 256
The Power to Borrow Money 257
Transitory Provisions 257
Regulations for Carrying the Act into effect 258
Continuance of Existing Laws, Courts, Officers, &c. 260
Definitions 261
SCHEDULES OF 1893 ... ... 263—270
1.—Legislative Council 263
2.—Irish Members in House of Commons 264
3.—Finance 265
4.—Provisions as to Post Office 266
5.—Gratuities and Pensions 266
6.—Police 267
7.—The Legislative Bodies 268
THE SCHEDULES OF 1886 270
GOOD PRECEDENTS TO FOLLOW 83
Greatness of Victory (1886) 154

H

HOME RULE BILLS OF 1893 AND 1886 COMPARED 232–270
HOME RULE AND CANADIAN HISTORY (Appendix XLVII.) 414
Honour to whom Honour is due 156

I

IMPERIAL EXPENDITURE (Appendix XXI.) 345
IMPERIAL UNITY DESTROYED 20
IMPORTANT POINTS IN IRISH HISTORY 273

Improvements in Post Office under Lord Salisbury (Appendix XXV.) 349
Injustice to British Taxpayers 97
Ireland has no real Grievances... 17
Ireland under Conservatives (Appendix VIII.) 310
Irish Coercion Acts 136
Irish Horrors of 1641 and 1798 ... ... 160—170
What the Loyalists have to dread 160
Irish Rebellion of 1798 163
The Rising at Prosperous and Kildare 163
Insurrection in Wexford... 165
The Camp at Vinegar Hill 166
The Battle at Wexford 167
Defeat of the Rebels at Vinegar Hill 168
Irish Land Purchase (Appendix IX.) 316
Irish Nonconformists' Appeal (Appendix XLI.) 383

L

Labour (Appendix XXI.) 363
Land Purchase Bill of 1886 150
Legislative Authority 232
Liberal Statesmen on the Irish Nationalists ... ... 201—206
Mr. Gladstone on Mr. Parnell 201
Mr. Gladstone on the Nationalist Press of Ireland 203
Mr. Gladstone on the objects of Irish Agitators 203
Mr. Gladstone quotes Mr. Parnell 203
Mr. Bright and Mr. Chamberlain 204
Sir William Harcourt 205
Local Taxation (Appendix XXII.) 347
Local Veto Bill (Appendix XLIV.) 391

M

Meath Election Petitions (Politics and Priests) ... ... 220—231
Merchandise Marks Act (Appendix XIII.) 324

N

National Defences (Appendix XXVII.) 352
Nationalists in 1885 (Appendix XLVIII.) 416
No cause for the Bill 18
No Finality 98

O

"One Man One Vote" (Appendix XVIII.) 33

P

Parnell Commission, Feb. 1890—Summary of Findings 377
Payment of Members (Appendix XLIII.) 388
Politics and Priests (Meath Election Petitions) ... ... 220—232
Post Office, Improvements in, under Ld. Salisbury (Appendix XXV) 349
Practical Outcome of Home Rule 71
Preface 3
Probable Irish Bankruptcy 30
Progress of Ireland under the Union ... ... 173—181
Promise v. Performance (Appendix I.) 271
Promises falsified 142

Q

Question of Ulster (Appendix III) 279

R

Railways and Canals (Appendix XXXVI) 374
Record of Unbroken Failure (Mr. Gladstone's) ... ... 132—156
Reduction of the National Debt (Appendix XXIII 348
Repeal of the Union ... ... 23 & 88
Revolt of Irish Loyalists (Appendix XLVI) 399

S

Lord Salisbury's Performances, &c. (Appendix XL) 322
Lord Salisbury in Ulster (Appendix XV) 332
Lord Salisbury, Foreign Affairs under (Appendix XXX) 359
Strategical Value of Ireland 23
Summary of Results in 1886 156

T

Tampering with Revolution 125
Test of Imperial Unity 22
The True Remedy 73
The Truth about Coercion 12
The Two Budgets (1893 & 1886.) 29
Trade Statistics (Appendix XX.) 344
Truth about Coercion 123

U

Ulster, The Question of (Appendix III.) 279
Ulster, Lord Salisbury on (Appendix XV.) 332
Mr. Parnell, M.P. 206
Union is Strength ... ... 15 & 75
"Union of Hearts" (Appendix VII.) 303
Union was necessary 24
Universal Failure (Mr. Gladstone's) 140

V

Views of the Irish Leaders ... ... 206—219
Mr. Biggar, M.P. 210
Mr. Healy's Record 210
Mr. W. O'Brien, M.P. 212
Mr. T. P. O'Connor, M.P. 214
Mr. Sexton, M.P. 215
Mr. Lalor, M.P. 215
Mr. John O'Connor, M.P. 216
Mr. John Deasy, M.P. 216
Mr. J. Huntley McCarthy, M.P. 216
Mr. E. Leamy, M.P. 216
Mr. O'Hanlon, M.P. 216
Mr. Mayne, M.P. 216
Mr. J. Boyton 216
Mr. J. J. O'Kelly, M.P. 217
Mr. W. Redmond, M.P. 217
Mr. J. E. Redmond, M.P. 218
P. W. Nally 218
P. J. Sheridan 218
Michael Davitt 219
Mr. O'Ryan 219

W

War Expenditure (Appendix XXVI.) 351
Why and How the Act of Union was Passed (Appendix V.) ... 282
Why a Special Alternative Scheme 146
Workshops and Factories (Appendix XXXV.)... 371

DETAILED INDEX OF THE HOME RULE BILLS OF 1893 AND 1886.

1893. 1886.

LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY, page 232.

1893.	Page	1886.	Page
Establishment of Irish Legislature	232	Establishment of Irish Legislature	232
Powers of Irish Legislature	232	Powers of Irish Legislature	232

EXCEPTIONS FROM POWERS OF IRISH LEGISLATURE, page 232.

RESTRICTIONS ON POWERS OF IRISH LEGISLATURE, page 233.

		Prerogatives of Her Majesty as to Irish Legislative Body	234
		Duration of Irish Legislative Body	234

EXECUTIVE AUTHORITY, page 235.

Executive Power in Ireland	235	Constitution of Executive Authority	235
		Use of Crown Lands by Irish Government	235

CONSTITUTION OF LEGISLATURE, page 235.

COMPOSITION OF IRISH LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL	235	CONSTITUTION OF IRISH LEGISLATIVE BODY	235
COMPOSITION OF IRISH LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.....	236	FIRST ORDER	236
Disagreement between two Houses —How settled	236	LEGISLATIVE BODY	236
RETENTION OF IRISH MEMBERS—		Cesser of power of Ireland to return Members of Parliament	237
Representation in Parliament of Irish Counties and Boroughs	237	SECOND ORDER.....	239

FINANCE.

As to Separate Consolidated Fund and Taxes.....	239	Taxes and Separate Consolidated Fund	239
Hereditary Revenue and Income Tax	240	Annual Contributions from Ireland to Consolidated Fund of United Kingdom	240
Financial Arrangements as between United Kingdom and Ireland	241	Collection and Application of Customs and Excise Duties in Ireland	242
Treasury Account (Ireland)	242	Changes on Irish Consolidated Fund.....	243
Charges on Consolidated Fund...	243	Irish Church Fund	243
Irish Church Fund	245	Public Loans	245
Local Loans.....	245	Additional aid in case of War ...	246
Adaptation of Acts as to Local Taxation Accounts and Probates, &c., Duties	246	Money Bills and Votes	246
Money Bills and Votes	247		

1893.		1886.	
EXCHEQUER DIVISION AND REVENUE ACTIONS, page 247.			
Exchequer Judges for Revenue Actions, Election Petitions, &c.	247	Exchequer Division and Revenue Actions	247
POST OFFICE, POSTAL TELEGRAPHS AND SAVINGS BANKS, page 249.			
Transfer of Post Office and Postal Telegraphs	249	Post Office and Savings Banks	249
Transfer of Savings Banks	250		
THE DECISION OF CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTIONS.			
Irish Appeals	250	Constitutional Questions to be submitted to Judicial Committee	250
Special Provisions for Decision of Constitutional Questions	251	Powers of Her Majesty	251
LORD LIEUTENANTS AND CROWN LANDS, page 252.			
Office of Lord Lieutenant	252	Office of Lord Lieutenant	252
Use of Crown Lands by Irish Government	252		
JUDGES AND CIVIL SERVANTS, page 252.			
Tenure of Future Judges	252	Judges to be removable only by Address	252
As to existing Judges and other persons having Salaries charged on the Consolidated Fund	253	Provision as to Judges and other persons having Salaries charged on the Consolidated Fund	253
As to persons holding Civil Service Appointments	253	As to persons holding Civil Service Appointments	253
As to Existing Pensions and Superannuation Allowances	254	Provision for Existing Pensions and Superannuation Allowances	254
POLICE, page 255.			
MISCELLANEOUS AUDIT, page 256.			
PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES, page 256.			
Law applicable to both Houses of Irish Legislature	256	Application of Parliamentary Law	256
Supplemental Provisions as to Powers of Irish Legislature	256		
THE POWER TO BORROW MONEY.			
Limitation of Borrowing by Local Authorities	257		

1893.	1886.

TRANSITORY PROVISIONS, page 257

Temporary Restriction on Powers of Irish Legislature and Executive 257	

REGULATIONS FOR CARRYING THE ACT INTO EFFECT, page 258.

Transitory Provisions 258	Saving Powers of House of Lords 259
	Saving of Rights of Parliament ... 259

CONTINUANCE OF EXISTING LAWS, COURTS, OFFICERS, &c., page 261.

	Mode of Alteration of Act 261
	Definitions 261

THE SCHEDULES OF 1893.

1st—Legislative Council—Constituencies, and Number of Councillors 263
2nd—Irish Members in the House of Commons 264
3rd—Finance—Imperial Liabilities, Expenditure, and Miscellaneous Revenue 265
4th—Provisions as to Post Office 266
5th—Regulations as to Gratuities and Pensions for Civil Servants (not detailed) 266
6th—Regulations as to Establishment of Police Forces, and as to the Royal Irish Constabulary and Dublin Metropolitan Police ceasing to exist 267
7th—The Legislative Bodies—Regulations as to Houses of the Legislature and the Numbers thereof 268
Legislative Council 268
Legislative Assembly 269
Both Houses 269
Transitory 269
THE SCHEDULES OF 1886 (Headings only) 270

APPENDICES.

PAGE

1.—Promise *v.* Performance 271
2.—Important Points in Irish History 273
3.—The Question of Ulster 279
4.—Constitution of the Irish Majority and Minority ... 280
5.—Why and How the Act of Union was Passed... 282
6.—Evictions—All about them 288
7.—"Union of Hearts" 303
8.—Ireland under Conservatives 310
9.—Irish Land Purchase 316
10.—Deeds, not Words 319
11.—Mr. Gladstone's Broken Promises, and Lord Salisbury's Performances 322
12.—Free Education... 323
13.—Merchandise Marks Act 324
14.—Egypt under Gladstone and Salisbury 326
15.—Lord Salisbury on Ulster 332
16.—Conservative Programme 334
17.—Mr. Balfour on London Questions 336
18.—One Man One Vote 338
19.—Mr. Dillon's Record 342
20.—Trade Statistics... 344
21.—Imperial Expenditure... 345
22.—Local Taxation 347
23.—Reduction of the National Debt 348
24.—Budget Summary 348
25.—Improvements in the Post Office under Lord Salisbury 349
26.—War Expenditure 351
27.—The National Defences 352

PAGE

28.—Army Administration 353
29.—Conservative Naval Administration 356
30.—Foreign Affairs under Lord Salisbury... 359
31.—Labour 363
32.—Agricultural Legislation 365
33.—Conservative Agricultural Administration 368
34.—Conservative Mines Legislation 370
35.—Factories and Workshops 371
36.—Railways and Canals 374
37.—Conservative Protection of Sailors 375
38.—Constructive Conservative Reforms 376
39.—Parnell Commission, February, 1890—Summary of Findings 377
40.—An Appeal to Nonconformists 381
41.—Irish Nonconformists' Appeal 383
42.—Defence of the Church in Wales 384
43.—Payment of Members 388
44.—The Local Veto Bill 391
45.—Electoral Statistics 395
46.—Revolt of the Irish Loyalists 399
47.—Canadian History and Home Rule 414
48.—The Nationalists in 1885 416

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY
Los Angeles

"ENGLAND," 2D.

THE BEST NATIONAL AND UNIONIST WEEKLY PAPER.

Publishing Offices :—291, STRAND, LONDON, W.C.

All who wish to succeed in Business should

ADVERTISE! ADVERTISE!! ADVERTISE!!!

"Advertising is to Business what Steam is to Machinery the great propelling power."—*Macaulay.*

"ENGLAND" is the best medium for Advertisements.

Its circulation is very large and influential, and covers the whole of the United Kingdom —England, Scotland, Ireland, and Wales.

Advertisements appearing in "ENGLAND" get a wider publicity than in any other weekly paper published in London.

"ENGLAND" is popular among all classes. It is taken by the great majority of the Conservative Peers and Members of Parliament, and is found in hundreds of County houses throughout the Kingdom.

"ENGLAND" is taken by most of the leading Merchants and Tradesmen, and is read by many thousands of Working Men in every part of the country.

Among the Annual Subscribers on the books of "ENGLAND" are hundreds of the most influential and leading members of all classes of Society.

"ENGLAND" contains a thorough and acute criticism of Commercial and Financial questions, and is recognised throughout London and the Provinces as the best medium in the weekly press for Company and other Financial Advertisements.

"ENGLAND" also contains—Best Prize Jokes; Best Political Articles; The most Reliable News; Ladies' Column, by an accomplished Lady Journalist; Social, Dramatic, Sporting, Volunteer, Gardening, and Household Notes, &c.

The following articles have already been published :—

1	Aug.	1	The Right Hon. Sir John Gorst, M.P., on "The Labour Question."
2		20	Mr. D. P. Barton, Q.C., M.P., on "The Irish Elections."
3		27	Sir E. Ashmead Bartlett, M.P., on "Why we Lost the General Election."
4	Sept.	3	Mr. W. E. Macartney, M.P., on "The Protestant Bogey."
5		10	Sir Ferrest Fulton, Q.C., on "Political Organisation in London."
6		17	"A Liberal Peer."
7		24	Sir Lepel Griffin, K.C.S.I., on "England and Russia in Central Asia."
8	Oct.	1	Colonel Howard Vincent, M.P., on "How Men are to Live."
9		8	G. S. Mackenzie, Esq., on "Uganda."
10		15	Mr. H. M. Stanley, on "The Claims of Uganda."
11		22	Col. G. B. Malleson, C.S.I., on "The Poisoning of Racehorses."
12		29	Mr. Victor Horsley, F.R.S., on "The Necessity of Vivisection."
13	Nov.	5	Mr. A. L. Mounteney Jephson, on "The Key of Central Asia."
14		19	"Interview with a 'Soul.'"
15		26	Mr. Edward Stanley Robertson, on "The House of Lords."
16	Dec.	3	Mr. H. Byron Reed, on "Old Fables Afresh."
17		10	The Right Hon. Lord George Hamilton, M.P., on "Home Rule and the Unemployed."
18		17	The Right Hon. James Lowther, on "The Agricultural Dilemma."
19		24	Colonel Edward Saunderson, M.P., on "Home Rule, Rome Rule."
20	Jan.	14	The Earl of Winchilsea, "After York."
21		21	Mr. T. Wrightson, M.P., on "Homes for the Working Classes."
22	Feb.	4	The Right Hon. Edward Stanhope, M.P., on "The Agricultural Labourer."
23		11	Mr. John E. Cooke, on "The Agricultural Union."
24		18	Mr. Walter Long, M.P., on "The Agricultural Elector."
25		25	Mr. C. A. Whitmore, M.P., on "The Home Rule Bill."
26	Mar.	4	Mr. H. Cosmo Bonson, M.P., on "The Local Veto Bill."
27		11	Capt. H. T. Bowles, M.P., on "How London can be Won."
28		18	Mr. C. B. Stuart Wortley, M.P., on "The Retention of the Irish Members."
29		25	Sir John Dorrington, on "District Councils."

"ENGLAND" is the best and most complete organ of Conservative and Unionist principles now published.

"ENGLAND" should be placed in every Conservative and Unionist Club and Reading Room throughout the Kingdom.

The MARQUIS OF SALISBURY, K.G., writes:—"*England* has been an able and effective advocate of Conservative opinion."

Mr. ARTHUR J. BALFOUR, M.P., writes:—"I am glad to have an opportunity of expressing my conviction that *England* is doing most excellent work in promoting a knowledge of Conservative principles throughout the country."

The MARQUIS OF ABERGAVENNY writes:—"I have much pleasure in giving my testimony to the immense good I believe *England* to have done. *England* has, by its open, sound, and consistent advocacy of Constitutional principles, done much to promote feelings of loyalty and love of order throughout the country, the importance of which cannot be overrated. I have from the commencement been a reader of *England*, and distribute many copies weekly, which are highly appreciated."

VISCOUNT CRANBROOK writes:—"I have helped to give *England* circulation wherever I could."

BARON ASHBOURNE (ex-Lord Chancellor of Ireland), writes:—"I feel very great pleasure in expressing my opinion that *England* has done a great and good service in encouraging a healthy public opinion, and diffusing sound Constitutional views. Its articles are clever, its political information good, and its news is well selected."

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON, M.P., writes:—"I have no hesitation in expressing my opinion that *England* has done valuable service in encouraging and promoting that sense of nationality and public spirit which can alone consolidate a community into a great nation."

Mr. HENRY CHAPLIN, M.P., writes:—"I cannot refrain from expressing my sense of the valuable aid rendered by *England* to the Conservative cause. From many quarters I have had most gratifying accounts of the good work it is doing amongst the working-men of this country."

Mr. EDWARD STANHOPE, M.P., Secretary for War, says:—"I have had much experience of the influence of *England* in rural and semi-rural districts, and I have a very high opinion of the work which it has done, is doing, and ought, if well supported, to do."

CAPTAIN MIDDLETON, Chief Conservative Agent, says:—"The sound political views so energetically laid before the working classes by *England* have been of great benefit to the Conservative party in all parts of the country."

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY
Los Angeles

This book is DUE on the last date stamped below.

Form L9–Series 4939

3 1158 01245 6918

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
AA 000 393 970 9